First Impression 1951

Printed by S. R. SARDESAI, B.A., LL.B., Navin Samarth Vidyalaya's Samarth Bharat Press, 41 Budhwar Peth, Poona 2, and Published by D. K. GONDHALEKAR, Poona Oriental Book House, 30 A Sadashiv Peth, Poona 2.

PREFACE

While reading the *Sanskrit Drama* with my I. A. and B. A. students, I have always noticed that they require a sort of practical guidance before they are able to understand and appreciate the skill displayed by the playwright. With this experience I felt that I should bring out some works which would serve as introduction to the study of at least some of the best Sanskrit dramatists; and about three years ago I wrote my '*Introduction to the Study of Viśākhadatta and his Mudrā-rākṣasa.*' The present work is the second of the series; and is planned and carried out exactly on the same lines as its predecessor.

In these pages I have tried to cover almost every topic in connection with Śūdraka and his play that a University Student may be expected to know. It is, however, hoped at the same time that even the general reader may find them useful and interesting.

For this work I have laid under contribution all available editions of the Mṛcchakaṭika, its translation by Dr. Ryder, and works of various other scholars whose debt I here gratefully acknowledge. I have also to thank my friend and pupil Sri S. T. Kenghe, B. A. (hons.) for preparing the *Index*. Thanks are also due to Sri Nanasaheb Gondhalekar for readily undertaking to publish the present work and to the management of the Samarth Bharat Press for doing the work with speed and care.

It is needless to add that suggestions from readers for improvement will be gratefully accepted and attended to at the earliest opportunity.

H. P. T. College, Nasik
31st October, 1951.

G. V. DEVASTHALI

CONTENTS

ERRATA

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
9	8	Abhāṇa	A bhāṇa
22	25	could	would
26	11	walking	waking
37	9	askes	asks
47	9	These	Those
61	28	jewel necklace	Suvarṇa bhāṇḍa
64	27	ratnāvalī	Suvarṇa bhāṇḍa
142	5	loked	looked

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

I Texts critically edited for the first time with Introduction &c. :—

1. *Śri-Gaṇeśa-kutukāmṛta* of Nānā Narendra.
2. *Anumiti-nirūpaṇa* of Rāmanārāyaṇa.
3. *Alaṁkāra-tilaka* of Bhānudatta.

II Chronological Problems :—

1. On the Probable Date of Jaimini.
2. On the Probable Date of Śabarasvāmin.
3. Veṇīdattaśarman and his *Rasikarañjanī*.
4. Gaṅgārāma Jaḍin.
5. Further light on the Date of Viṣṇupurī and his *Bhakti-ratnāvalī*.
6. Jagannāthapaṇḍita alias Umānandanātha.
7. Harṣa, the author of the *Aṅkayantra-cintāmaṇi*.
8. Some Positive Data for the Date of Śabarasvāmin.
9. Śabara and Patañjali.

III. Mīmāṁsāśāstra :—

1. Mīmāṁsā, the Vākyaśāstra of Ancient India.
2. Mīmāṁsā and Modern Science of Interpretation.
3. Jaimini and Śabara on Language.
4. Jaimini and Śabara on Words.
5. Jaimini and Śabara on Classes of Words.
6. Śabara and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika.
7. Śaṅkarācārya's Indebtedness to Mīmāṁsā.

IV. Literary Criticism :—

1. Introduction to the Study of Bāṇa and his *Kādambarī*.

2. Introduction to the Study of Viśākhadatta and his *Mudrā-rākṣasa*.
3. *Praveśakas* and *Viṣkambhakas* in the Plays of Bhāsa.

V. Bhagavadgītā :—

1. Karma in the *Bhagavadgītā*.
2. Bhakti in the *Bhagavadgītā*.
3. Renunciation in the *Bhagavadgītā*.
4. *Summum Bonum in the Bhagavadgītā*.

VI. Descriptive Catalogue :—

1. Descriptive Catalogue of the Sk. and Pk. MSS. in the University Library, Bombay.
2. Descriptive List of the JS. MSS. in the H. P. T. College library, Nasik.

VII. History of Sanskrit Literature (From 320–1000 A.D.)

Contributed to the History of India (in ten Volumes) projected by the Bhāratīya Itihāsa Samiti, Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavana, Bombay 7.

*

CHAPTER I

THE AUTHOR

A student of Sanskrit literature will not be surprised at the variety of problems he has to face when he tries to discuss the authorship of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. In the opening sentence of the *prologue* we are told that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is a *prakaraṇa*. Then follow three verses giving the name and other details about the author, and two more in which we get the main points of the plot. Thus we are told : Śūdraka was a famous poet, of handsome form and features, stately gait, and no mean valour, and the best of *kṣatriyas*. He was well-versed in the *Ṛgveda* and the *Sāmaveda*, Mathematics, fine arts and the art of training elephants ; performed a horse sacrifice, crowned his son a king, and enjoying a full span of a hundred years and ten days, entered fire. He was a king, fond of war, ever vigilant and addicted to combats with mighty elephants.[1]

There are, however, reasons[2] to doubt the authenticity of these verses giving all this information ; and some scholars are inclined to reject the information altogether as unauthentic and put forth their own theories in this connection. Thus Keith[3] holds 'that Śūdraka was a merely legendary person' and that 'the author who wrote up the *Cārudatta*, and combined with it a new play, thought it well to conceal his identity and to pass off the work under the appellation of a famous king'. Levi[4] further suggests that the author did this in order to give his work an air of antiquity by ascribing it to a prince earlier than Vikramāditya. Levi's view, how-

ever, is far-fetched and Keith's view also is a mere assumption with no firm ground to support it. Another theory[5] based on Rājaśekhara's reference to *Dhāvaka Bhāsa*, makes Bhāsa himself the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* which according to it, is only a later development of his own *Daridra-Cārudatta*. The ascription of the play to Śūdraka is sought to be explained here as being due to Bhāsa—a śūdra author—having met with ridicule and persecution at the hands of people with vested interest. This theory, also, ingenious as it is, fails to convince because it can't explain why of all the names Śūdraka alone is chosen by the author and also why no other play of Bhāsa is ascribed to Śūdraka. According to a third view the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is *Daṇḍin*. Pischel, who first propounded this view, identified Śūdraka with Daṇḍin on the strength of one[6] verse which he found common to the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Kāvyādarśa*; and also because the state of society in the former is similar to that in the *Daśakumāracarita*. Neither of the grounds, however, is strong enough to support Daṇḍin's authorship of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*; and the theory was abandoned till it was recently revived by Prin. Karmarkar[7] on the basis of a large number of similarities, verbal as well as conceptual, between our play and the *Kāvyādarśa.* But it must be said that mere similarity of expression and ideas can't be taken as a sound and sufficient ground for identity of authorship. Nor is it right to say that Daṇḍin, whenever he borrows, has given indications of his borrowing, so much so that when there is no such indication given by him he should be understood as drawing upon his own composition. For instances[8] to the contrary are given by Prin. Karmarkar himself. The whole theory must, therefore, wait till any strong positive argument is found to support it.

We, however, agree with him that, inspite of the spurious nature of the verses above referred to, the information contained in them is not necessarily untrustworthy. We, therefore, take it for granted that the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is Śūdraka—a king, until any thing is proved to the contrary. The only thing that we can say with some certainty about our author is that he is a southerner as is shown by the reference to the *Sahyavāsinī*[9], Dākṣiṇātyāḥ[10] in general, several southern tribes,[11] and some words like *Khuṇṭamoḍaka*, and *Varaṇḍalambuka*. Beyond that, however, it is neither possible nor safe to go in the present state of our knowledge.

Next comes the problem of the identity of this king Śūdraka. Here again attempts have been made by several scholars to identify him with some king or the other in Ancient India. Thus some[12] identify him with king Śūdraka of the Kumārikākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa (dated 190 A. D. there) and this Śūdraka they further identify with Simuka (variously written as *Sidhuka*, *Śiśuka* and *Śipraka*) who founded the Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty after a successful revolution about 200 B. C. Inspite of the various arguments adduced in its support the theory must crash on two rocks viz. the difference of nomenclature and the wide gulf of about four centuries separating the two. Attempt is also made to identify him with Vikramāditya[13] on the ground that the *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* describes Śūdraka as a *brāhmaṇa* king of Ujjayinī, a great poet, who defeated the Āndhrabhṛtya prince Svāti about 56 B. C. The acceptability of this identification depends on the authenticity of the *Avantisundarīkathāsāra*. Exploits of a third Śūdraka, Rājaśekhara tells us,[14] 'have been sung

by Rāmila and Saumilla (predecessors of Kālidāsa). There are, in fact, a host of works in Sanskrit literature[15] giving us information about Śūdraka and his adventures ; and the name appears by the time of Bāṇa to have become more legendary than real. Under these circumstances it is almost impossible to be definite about the identity of our author with any king of Ancient India.

This brings us to the problem of date ; and we find that the two limits for it are supplied by the *Cārudatta* of Bhāsa on the one hand and Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti* on the other. After a careful and critical examination of the similarities and differences between our play and the *Cārudatta*, scholars have arrived at the conclusion that the Cārudatta version is on the whole older than the Mṛcchakaṭika,[16] and Vāmana is the earliest author to quote from it[17]. We have now to see if this range between these two limits can be narrowed down. The fact that two full verses and one line from our play are found verbatim in the *Pañcatantra*[18] may perhaps take its lower limit to the 5th century A. D. The *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*[19] has several reminiscences of our play which may perhaps justify the conclusion that Śūdraka is earlier than Viśākhadatta. But that does not take us any further ; for the date of Viśākhadatta himself is not as yet definitely settled. Similarly several parallellisms[20] are pointed out between our play and the poems and plays of Kālidāsa. But only one line is actually found to be common to both; and that is too soft a ground to tread on. Nothing again can be concluded from the resemblance[21] of the theme of our play with that of the *Śākuntala*. Nor can the resemblances[22] between the *Kāvyādarśa* and our play be of much help in this connection. There are various similarities of

ideas between our play on the one hand and the *Daśakumāracarita*[23] or the *Kathāsaritsāgara*[24] on the other. Such for example are the theme of a youthful and rich courtesan falling in love with a poor Brāhmaṇa youth, description of the palatial mansion (like that of Vasantsenā), the details of the art and science of thievery and gambling. But this can't be a conclusive evidence for fixing up the question of chronology. It is more likely than not that Śūdraka has drawn his material from a work like the *Bṛhatkathā* (of Guṇāḍhya) which forms the basis of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* itself.

Attempt is also made to determine the date of our play on the strength of some astronomical, legal and other ideas occurring in it. Thus the horoscopic system utilised at VI. 9-10 in our play, according to Jacobi, points to at least the end of the foruth century A. D.; while the view of *Mars* being opposed to *Jupiter*[25] is said to be far anterior to Varāhamihira who gives it in his *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* as a view held by his predecessors. Similarly reference to the four ordeals,[26] the presence of a śreṣṭhin as an assessor, the rule that the judge is only to decide a case while the dispensation of the sentence is the special prerogative of the king[27] and such other features revealed by the court scene are taken by Jolly[28] to point to a date later than Nārada and Bṛhaspati. But it must be noted that the law-givers only record the law already current in their days so that the features should be indicative of a date prior to the above law-givers who are the earliest known to record these features. The dates of Nārada and Bṛhaspati are now shown[29] to lie between 100 A. D. and 400 A. D.; and as such cannot be later than 400 A. D. The attitude towards Buddhism[30] and the position of the Buddhistic monk in our play has

its root in Bhāsa and has moreover its parallel in Kālidāsa, Viśākhadatta and Śrīharṣa. It cannot, therefore, serve as a solid ground for fixing any date for our play. The express reference to Manu's authority on law (IX. 39), perhaps may show that Śūdraka can't be much earlier than the beginning of the Christian Era.

Dr. Paranjpe[31] discusses the word *rāṣṭriya* occurring in our play and points out that there it signifies merely a police-officer while even in Kālidāsa's *Śākuntala* it is used in the sense of a king's brother-in-law. The same is the sense ascribed to that term in the *Amarakośa*. He, therefore, holds that Śūdraka must have preceded Kālidāsa. This early date for Śūdraka he tries to support further on the strength of words like *Kāṇelī*, *Śakāra* and *Ajjukā*. The first, according to him, is the name of Saṁsthānaka's mother, a proper noun and has later on acquired the general signification of an unchaste woman and a concubine. Śakāra is only a popular name got by Saṁsthānaka on account of the *śakārabahulatva* of his speech; and has later on come to signify a class of people. *Ajjukā* similarly is a form of *Āryā* popularised by our play but with a special significance attached to it. Attempt to determine chronology on the strength of Prākṛts is not quite successful, though Gawronski[32] has shown that our play has a smaller proportion of the forms in *ttaṇa* (as against in *dā*) than Kālidāsa's plays whose proportion is again smaller than the plays of Śrīharṣa and Rājaśekhara; for, the rule implicitly assumed in this argument is vitiated by Bhāsa's plays where the proportion is just the reverse.

It must, however, be noted that there are some passages in the Mṛcchakaṭika which can be understood only

if they are read in the original Prākṛt. Take, for example, the passage :—

चेट: —(स्वगतम्) भोदु । एव्वं भणिश्शम् ! (प्रकाशम्) अले पण्हं दे दइश्शम् ।

विदूषक:—अहं दे मुण्डे गोडं दइस्सम् । (Act V. p. 151).

Now this passage in its Sanskrit rendering is not quite easy to understand, though it has been explained by annotators in their own way. And surely the beauty and humour of the original is all lost to one who cannot understand the original Prākṛt, particularly the pun on the word पण्हं which in Sanskrit is either प्रश्न (as it is usually rendered) or पार्ष्णि (heel). When we know this we see how मैत्रेय has retaliated by saying that if कुम्भीलक intended to give him only पण्ह (= पार्ष्णि or heel), he would give him the whole of his पाद्.[32a] A similar passage we come across in Act VIII where the संवाहक's eulogy is misunderstood by शकार. शकार's declaration ' मम हस्ते एशा णाशेण चिश्टदु । ' also has a pun on णाशेण which means न्यास (as विट understands it) and also नाश (as very likely शकार intends it to mean). This phenomenon in our play may be taken to point out to a date when Prākṛt was not only spoken but commonly understood by all.

Technique is taken as yet another point for determining Śūdraka's date. Thus the absurd phenomenon represented by the stage direction *niṣkramya punaḥ-praviśya*[33], the scenes of violence on the stage, figures like Śakāra and *viṭa*, the hero not being present on the stage[34] or the *prakaraṇa* i. e. the play not being named after the hero and the heroine[35]—all these have been supposed to be indicative of the early age of our play. But it must be noted that almost all of these are from the *Cārudatta* and as such can't determine the age of our

play ; and the stage direction *niṣkramya punaḥ praviśya* and the hero not being present on the stage in every act are found in Viśākhadatta's *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*[36] while the former is found even in Kālidāsa's plays[37].

After all this discussion then we may be justified in arriving at the following conclusions regarding the date of Śūdraka and his Mṛcchakaṭika : (i) Śūdraka must be later than Bhāsa whose *Cārudatta* he recast and earlier than Vāmana who quotes a sentence found in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* only ; (ii) Very likely he is earlier than even Viśākhadatta who shows the influence of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* in his *Mudrā-Rākṣasa* ; (iii) The lower limit of Śūdraka may be pushed up to the 4th century A. D. on the strength of the astronomical and legal ideas occurring in it ; and lastly (iv) linguistic considerations may perhaps justify us in making Śūdraka a predecessor of Kālidāsa also (who mentions Bhāsa but does not mention him). (v). But he can't be much earlier than the beginning of the Christian Era as is shown by express reference to Manu.

There is not much to be said about the scholarship of Śūdraka. He has shown his acquaintance with astrology (and astronomy also perhaps) and a very sound knowledge of the legal procedure. Act IX has been so cleverly managed and the pieces of evidence have been so brought out one after another that one can't but admire the legal acumen possessed by our author. His general knowledge of the language (*Sanskrit* as well as the large number of *Prakrits*[38]) and abundant sprinkling of mythological references and also figures of speech, and use of different metres short as well as long with good ease are enough to show his general equipment as a poet, while his equipment as a dramatist can easily be guessed

from the skill he has displayed in managing his raw materials and infusing life into them. There is hardly any indication regarding his religious belief, and yet from the *nāndī* verses and the references to *Vṛṣabha-ketu*[39] and the *sahyavāsinī*, one may be inclined to say that he was a *śaiva*, and a believer in the Vedic ritualistic religion as may perhaps be gathered from a remark put in the mouth of Cārudatta.[40] *Abhāṇa*, named *Padma-prābhṛtaka* is generally ascribed to him though there is nothing that can establish it or refute it beyond all doubt.[41]

CHAPTER II

THE PLOT

The Prologue

After the recital of the *nāndī*, the stage-manager appears on the stage respectfully informing the spectators that he would be enacting the play (*prakaraṇa*) *Mṛccha-kaṭika* from the pen of king *Śūdraka* who is endowed with qualities not only of head and heart, but even of physique. He then declares that the play depicts the ways of politics, stupidity and perversity of legal procedure, the nature of the villain, and (the working of) destiny, all based on the episode of love between Vasantasenā and Cārudatta.

Giving this preliminary information, he turns homewards to see if he could get any break-fast to allay his hunger, and to his wonder he finds very gaudy and sumptuous preparations going on there--something quite contrary to his expectation. He calls out his wife and asks what, if at all, she would give him for break-fast ; and when he is told that she would give him any thing he liked, he in wonder asks if she was not only cutting a joke. The wife at this is tempted to cut a joke and tells that everything was ready in the market. Being enraged at this he utters a nasty curse on her. But being appeased by her soft words, he then desires to know the occasion that has demanded all this preparation ; and being told that it was all for the observance *abhirūpapati* which is said to secure a good husband in the next world, he is again upset at the idea that his wife should seek to secure

a husband in the other world at his expense. He also curses Jūrṇavṛddha, his friend, for having suggested such an observance to her. The wife once more appeases him by falling at his feet and assuring him that it was for securing *him only* as her husband that she was observing the fast. Then learning from her that a good *Brāhmaṇa* was required for the occasion, he goes out in search of one, and comes across Maitreya, Cārudatta's friend, who, however, declines the invitation in spite of all the temptations held out to him. He, therefore, proposes to go out in search of some other *Brāhmaṇa*, and leaves the stage.

ACT I

Maitreya appears on the stage repeating the reply he has given to the stage-manager, and in a soliloquy giving us a brief idea of his former prosperity and present miserable lot owing to a similar change of circumstances which has come over Cārudatta, his dear friend. He wants to see Cārudatta to whom he has to give the *jasmine-scented mantle* sent for him by his dear friend Jūrṇavṛddha.

At this stage Cārudatta is seen coming out of his house to offer oblation to the house-hold deities, accompained by Radanikā, his maid. He is deeply sorrow-stricken at the sight of his threshold over-grown with grass. In this pensive mood he is greeted by Maitreya whom, of course, he offers a warm welcome. The latter hands over to him the mantle and also the message sent by Jūrṇavṛddha. Here again Cārudatta lapses into his pensive mood roused by the thought that to go from prosperity to adversity is no better than death ; for death unlike poverty, does not cause endless pain, and is as

such to be preferred to it. Maitreya tries to cheer him up ; but he tells him that he is sorry not so much for the loss of wealth, as for the fact that even friends desert the poor in his adversity and that poverty brings in its wake all sorts of calamities in close succession. He then describes a poor man's lot in general and requests Maitreya to go and offer the oblation to the household deities. The latter, however, refuses to do so, first on the ground that the deities have shown no appreciation of his piety at all ; and when Cārudatta asserts that the act is obligatory, he gives out the fact that he is afraid of moving out at that dark hour when courtesans, royal personages and their favourites, etc. move about in the streets. Cārudatta thereon asks Maitreya to wait till he has his meditation.

While Cārudatta is thus engaged in his meditation in his house, on the street adjoining his house is seen Vasantasenā pursued by *Viṭa*, *Ceṭa* and *Śakāra*, who in succession address her, each in his own way, language and style, trying to dissuade her from running away and assuring her that there was no reason for her to be afraid of them. Vasantasenā in her fear calls out to her servants, only to find that she has somehow managed to slip away from them and that now she has to face the situation all alone. Śakāra, being assured that she was only calling out to her servants and maids, assumes airs and tells Vasantasenā that none can save her against him. And when she pleads that she is only *abalā*, Viṭa as well as Śakāra tells her that that is exactly why she is being pursued and not killed. Vasantasenā asks them whether they desired to have her ornaments and is told by Śakāra of his suit which she summarily and scornfully rejects. But Śakāra misunderstands her words and feels glad. Viṭa also tries to per-

suade her to accept the offer. Vasantasenā, however, plainly declares that love rests on merits and not force. As it is now growing dark, Śakāra asks Viṭa to take care lest Vasantasenā slips away into the house of Cārudatta nearby with whom she is already in love. Vasantasenā does take the hint and slips away leaving Śakāra (and apparently Viṭa also) to search for her. The Viṭa, however, indirectly gives her a hint to take off her ornaments lest she be betrayed by their jingling. She does accordingly and after some groping in the dark, comes by the side-door of Cārudatta's house, which, however, is closed.

By this time Cārudatta's meditation is over; and he requests Maitreya once again to offer the oblation to the mother deities. A flat refusal from the latter again evokes from Cārudatta, a lamentation on poverty; and being moved thereby, Maitreya offers to go out on condition that Radanikā accompanies him. Cārudatta agrees; Radanikā holds the lamp, Maitreya opens the door, and they are about to step out when the lamp is extinguished (not by a gust of wind as Maitreya thinks, but) by Vasantasenā who goes in as soon as the door is opened. Maitreya asks Radanikā to go out while he would go in and bring the lamp re-lighted.

Just at this stage Śakāra who has previously caught hold of Viṭa and Ceṭa mistaking them for Vasantasenā, happens to seize Radanikā, being sure this time that she was Vasantasenā; and when Radanikā shouts out he tells Viṭa that Vasantasenā has cleverly affected a different voice. But Maitreya returns with the lamp, protests against the trespass by strangers and when he comes to know from Radanikā of her insult by *Śakāra*, he bursts out in a fit of anger. Viṭa, however, falls at his feet and not only appeases him, but even secures from him a

promise not to disclose the matter to Cārudatta. He then proclaims to Śakāra the greatness of Cārudatta and his merits, and proposes to go away from there without Vasantasenā who has now disappeared. Śakāra, however, refuses to agree and hence Viṭa goes away all alone. Śakāra then exchanges several humorous questions and answers with Maitreya and ultimately asks him to convey to Cārudatta his message that he should personally hand over to him Vasantasenā who has slipped into his house, or be prepared for a life-long enmity with him. Maitreya agrees to do so ; and Śakāra leaves the stage along with his Ceṭa. Maitreya asks Radanikā not to disclose the incident to Cārudatta and she agrees to it.

In the meanwhile Cārudatta mistaking Vasantasenā for Radanikā throws his mantle at her and asks her to cover his son, sleeping in the wind outside, with it and bring him in. Vasantasenā is attracted by the scent of the mantle ; but remembering that she was only a *gaṇikā* could not carry out the desire of Cārudatta. Cārudatta is, however, again sad at the thought of the effects of poverty. While Cārudatta is in this mood, Maitreya enters with the remark ' Here is Radanikā '. This clears up the situation and Cārudatta is sorry that he has troubled some good lady. Maitreya, however, tells him that it was Vasantasenā ; and further delivers the message of Śakāra whom Cārudatta scornfully declares to be a fool. He then begs pardon of Vasantasenā who also begs his pardon for having entered his house at that hour and Maitreya mockingly imitates them by bowing himself before them both. Vasantasenā now makes up her mind and requests to be allowed to deposit her ornaments for safety ; and Maitreya accepts them for Cārudatta. Vasantasenā then requests Cārudatta to reach her home ;

and as Maitreya is unwilling to go alone, Cārudatta himself accompanies her upto her house. Then Maitreya and Cārudatta go into the house ; and the latter tells the former that the ornaments shall be looked after by him and Vardhamānaka by night and by day respectively.

ACT II

This act opens with the appearance of a *ceṭī* on the stage who declares that she is going to Vasantasenā with her mother's message. Then we see Vasantasenā in her apartment sitting in a lovelorn condition and conversing with her maid, Madanikā. The first *ceṭī* comes in and tells Vasantasenā that her mother desires her to take her bath and do the worship. Vasantasenā, however, sends word that she would not take her bath that day and that the priest should be asked to do the worship. After the *ceṭī* has left, Madanikā asks Vasantasenā what was wrong with her; and on knowing that she was in love, she desires to know what sort of man he was. She is then told that he is neither a prince nor a royal favourite, nor a learned Brāhmaṇa, nor yet a wealthy merchant. He is the man whom they met at the love-temple-garden, Cārudatta. She loves him all the more because of his poverty ; but is afraid to offer her love straightway lest she might be repudiated and lose all chance of winning him. Hence it is that she has deposited her ornaments with him, so that she may have an opportunity of seeing him again.

Here with a toss of curtain enters on the stage Saṁvāhaka who tells us how he is ruined by gambling, and how he has fled away from the *sabhika* and his comrade. He then walks backward and entering an empty temple, assumes the position of the idol therein. Māthura i. e. the *sabhika* and his comrade then come up in search of

him, and in a short while noticing his trick, begin their play in that very temple. As they hold a discussion during their play, the Saṁvāhaka, unable to resist his temtation any longer, discloses his identity and is caught. He then pleads indigency and even uses his ingenuity but has at last to request the *sabhika* to take him to the high-way to get himself sold for paying off his dues. But even there he could not succeed and Māthura drags him, and he shouts for help.

Now Darduraka, another gambler, appears on the stage singing hymns to *dyūta* and is taken aback at the sight of Māthura whom he tries to avoid by covering himself with his mantle. But the mantle was too tattered to conceal him ; and he decides to face Māthura boldly. In the meanwhile a crowd had gathered round Māthura , who is dragging Saṁvāhaka ; and Darduraka , thinking of helping the latter, approaches the former, enquires what the matter is, and being told that Saṁvāhaka owed ten gold coins, says that it was only a paltry amount. He then suggests that Saṁvāhaka should be given a debt of ten coins, so that he might play again and pay off his debts if he won in the game. But now the patience of Māthura is exhausted and he calls Darduraka a loose character which leads to wordy quarrel between the two ; and as Māthura drags Saṁvāhaka again and breaks his nose with his fist, he falls in a swoon and Darduraka, who tries to intervene, has to hit Māthura in return. Darduraka, then after some exchange of words, throws dust into Māthura's eyes, beckons to Saṁvāhaka to be off; and himself decides to join Āryaka, the cow-boy, who according to a sooth-sayer was to be a king.

Saṁvāhaka looks up here and there and finds the side-door of a house open. He enters the house and seeks protection from the mistress viz. Vasantasenā. Vasantasenā gets the door closed, but has it re-opened when she learns from Saṁvāhaka that he was being pursued for ten coins. Just at this stage Māthura and his comrade, following the track of the blood, know that Saṁvāhaka has entered Vasantasenā's house ; and hence wait for him at the gate outside. Then Madanikā at Vasantasenā's suggestion asks Saṁvāhaka his whereabouts and learns from him that he is the son of a village headman, had learnt the art of shampooing which, through misfortune, had to be used as livelihood. He was in the service of a highly meritorious personage of that town, Cārudatta by name, who is now reduced to poverty. Vasantasenā on hearing this immediately asks her maid to offer a seat to him and fan him. Saṁvāhaka is highly struck at the great respect shown to him by Vasantasenā ; and in reply to a query tells her that he thereafter led the life of a gambler and lost ten coins for which he was being now hunted by two persons. Just at this stage is heard outside the voice of Māthura and his comarde ; and Vasantasenā handing over a bracelet from her hand to Madanikā asks her to hand it over to them in payment of the dues of Saṁvāhaka. Madanikā does accordingly and they go away satisfied. Saṁvāhaka then requests Vasantasenā to have him in her service which she politely declines and he then declares his resolve to turn a monk and asks Vasantasenā to remember that he has become a monk. As Saṁvāhaka makes a move, from behind the curtain is heard the news that Vasantasenā's elephant has run amock. He has half a mind to go and see him ; but he curbs his desire and goes away to put his resolve into action.

Then enters with a toss of curtain Karṇapūraka who tells Vasantasenā how her elephant was amock, how he had lifted up a monk, how he bravely brought the elephant under control and rescued the monk, how the whole city was all praise for him, and how one gentleman, his limbs destitute of ornaments, alas, with a heavy sigh, threw his mantle on him, in appreciation of his bravery. At Vasantasenā's instance, he now finds that the mantle is jasmine-scented and Vasantasenā reads the name on it, Cārudatta. She then takes it for herself and satisfies Karṇapūraka with the gift of an ornament instead. Then knowing from the latter that Cārudatta was going that very way, she with her maid moves out to go up the terrace and see Cārudatta.

ACT III

This act opens with the appearance of Vardhamānaka on the stage awaiting the return of Cārudatta who has gone out with his friend for a musical performance. It is past mid-night ; and Vardhamānaka, being tired, goes and sleeps in the outer quadrangle of Cārudatta's house. Just at this stage Cārudatta and Maitreya are seen on their way home, discussing the performance of Rebhila, and the latter drawing attention to the moon on her descent and suggesting that it was very late. On reaching home, Maitreya calls out to Vardhamānaka who opens the door and after their feet are duly washed, hands over the ornaments to Maitreya and goes away to bed. Maitreya suggests that they may be kept in the inner chamber ; but does not do so in deference to the argument and desire of Cārudatta ; and they fall asleep.

Just at this stage in the grove outside the house is seen Śarvilaka who, as he informs us, has cut his

entrance into the fencing grove and would now break into the inner chamber also. Then giving us several details about his work and profession and also the skill required therein, he uses his sacred thread for a tape and cuts a hole into the wall. Seeing a burning lamp inside, he first makes sure that there was no one nearby, slips inside and stealthily opens the door. He then makes sure that the two men were really asleep, and looking around finds that he has entered a poor man's house. This he confirms with the help of the magical seeds and is about to go away, when Maitreya, speaking in his sleep, requests his friend to take the gold casket. Śarvilaka extinguishes the burning lamp and takes over the casket from Maitreya whom he leaves to sleep soundly. He then tells us that he has done all this for the sake of Madanikā for whom now he would go to Vasantasenā's house. Just at this moment he hears some foot-steps and prepares to meet the situation. But finding that it was a woman, Radanikā, he leaves her alone and goes away.

Radanikā, not finding Vardhamānaka in the outer quadrangle, awakens Maitreya and tells him that a thief has broken into their house and is running away. Maitreya, when he becomes aware of the situation conveys the news to Cārudatta who, when he is shown the hole in the wall, praises the thief's art. He, at the same time, feels sorry that the thief must have gone away empty-handed. Maitreya at this point boasts of his wisdom in handing over the casket to him in good time. But Cārudatta does not remember to have received it. Maitreya, therefore, tries to remind him of the incident by repeating his remark on the occasion. Cārudatta searches for the casket; and not finding it anywhere in the

house, he feels sure, to his satisfaction, that it is stolen away. Being reminded that it was only a deposit, he falls in a swoon. And he emphatically contradicts Maitreya's suggestion by declaring that he would never tell a lie and thus lose his character.

In the meanwhile, Radanikā goes out and informs Dhūtā who then appears on the stage along with a maid. On learning from her maid that Cārudatta was not injured, but only the casket was stolen, she swoons and on recovering from it, she expresses great concern for her husband's *Cāritra* which was now in danger. She then at once thinks of helping him through his friend; and sends for Maitreya and hands over to him *her necklace* asking him to give it to her husband on account of the *ratna-ṣaṣthī* fast which she has observed. Maitreya, struck by this magnanimity of Dhūtā, does her bidding; and when Cārudatta knows the source of the necklace, he feels himself to be very poor at first thought, but is very proud of his wife ultimately. He then immediately asks Maitreya to take the necklace to Vasantasenā and give it to her with the message that Cārudatta lost her casket in gambling and in repayment of it is giving the necklace to her. He then orders the hole in the wall to be filled up, requests Maitreya to be dignified in his speech to Vasantasenā, and goes away to perform his *Saṁdhyā*, remembering all the while the magnanimity of his wife.

ACT IV

Act IV begins with the appearance on the stage of a maid who informs us that she has to convey her mother's word to Vasantasenā whom she finds in her apartment, her eyes rivetted on a painting and conversing with Madanikā. Vasantasenā with her maid is seen then in her

apartment holding conversation about a painting in the former's hand which reveals clearly the depth of her love for Cārudatta ; the first *ceṭī* then comes in and informs Vasantasenā on her mother's behalf that a veiled car was ready at the door and that she has to go. Vasantasenā, however, knowing that it was Śakāra, asks the maid to quit and convey word to her mother that she should never send her any word like that if she desired her to live. The *ceṭī* goes away.

About this time Śarvilaka is seen outside the house of Vasantasenā, referring to his guilty conscience and at the same time to the code of honour he has observed. While he is thus loitering there, Madanikā is sent by Vasantasenā to keep away the painting in her bed-room and fetch a fan. On her way back she is noticed and called by Śarvilaka who, making sure that the place was quite secluded, asks her whether Vasantasenā would set her free for a ransom. By this time Vasantasenā, wondering why her maid was so late, looked through her lattices and seeing that Madanikā was engaged in a loving conversation with Śarvilaka refrains from calling her; and at the same time finding that they were speaking something about her she also resolves to overhear them. Madanikā tells Śarvilaka that her mistress would, if she likes, leave all her servants even without any ransom; and desires to know from where he has got so much money. Śarvilaka tells her that he has committed a theft, but assures her that he has not violated the code of honour even in his rash deeds. With this he presents the ornaments to her: and she recognising them at once, asks him where he got them from; and on knowing that he got them from Cārudatta's house, both Madanikā as well as her mistress fall in a swoon. Śarvilaka then revives Madanikā, who is much relieved by

his assurance that none in that house is hurt. This, however, rouses his jealousy and he breaks into a volley of rebukes and abusive generalisations on woman and ultimately makes a move to go and kill Cārudatta. Madanikā, however, at once catches hold of his skirts and tells him that the ornaments belong to her mistress who had deposited them with Cārudatta. Śarvilaka now realises the gravity of the situation and his own folly; and requests Madanikā to find a way out of the difficulty. The suggestion that the ornaments should be returned to Cārudatra himself is rejected as impractical; and she then suggests that he should give them to Vasantasenā herself as having been returned by Cārudatta, so that she would get her ornaments, Cārudatta would be free from liability and he himself would be free from the guilt of the theft. Śarvilaka after some pressure from Madanikā accepts the proposal; and is asked to wait there while she herself goes to inform Vasantasenā, of his arrival. Then with Vasantasenā's permission Śarvilaka enters the hall (where Vasantasenā has already returned) and after proper greetings hands over the ornaments with Cārudatta's message. Vasantasenā then requests him to take her message in return; and before he could realise what the matter was, tells him that Cārudatta has asked her to hand over Madanikā to one who could come to her with the ornaments. While Śarvilaka is singing praise of Cārudatta for what has happened, Vasantasenā calls for a cart, gives them a send off and tells Madanikā that she has now a status higher than herself. After proper salutations the cart starts. Just at this moment a proclamation is heard from behind the curtain declaring that Āryaka (the cow-boy destined to be a prince one day) is captivated and that all should be on their guard. This appeals to the friend in Śarvi-

laka, who, of course with the willing consent of his bride, arranges to reach her home and himself goes away to raise a rebellion in aid of Āryaka.

Now a maid informs Vasantasenā of the arrival of a Brāhmaṇa from Cārudatta. Vasantasenā asks her to bring him along with *bandhula*. Maitreya then is taken through the outer porch, and the eight quadrangles, all of which he describes in full details. He then sees the brother and the mother of Vasantasenā and after various humorous remarks ultimately enters the grove of trees (which also he describes) where Vasantasenā is seated. After preliminary exchange of greetings, in reply to Vasantasenā's question he informs her that Cārudatta has lost the ornaments, deposited by her with him, in gambling and that he has sent a neck-lace in lieu of them. Vasantasenā is deeply struck by this and after some consideration accepts the neck-lace quite against the expectation of Maitreya. She also sends word that she would see him personally in the evening. This rouses Maitreya's suspision and he goes away in that mood.

Vasantasenā also hands over the necklace to her maid and inspite of the gathering storm, to which her *ceṭī* draws her attention, resolves to pay a visit to Cārudatta and orders the *ceṭī* to bring her necklace without delay.

ACT V

This act begins with Cārudatta overpowered with love-longing appearing on the stage seated on a seat giving a glowing and detailed description of the rainstorm, and wondering why Maitreya has not returned as yet from Vasantasenā's house. Maitreya is then introduced on his way home bitterly complaining of the treatment

he has received from Vasantasenā and deciding to warn Cārudatta against her. He, finding Cārudatta in the grove of trees, approaches him and informs him that Vasantasenā has accepted the necklace unhesitatingly and requests him to beware of her. Cārudatta declares that circumstances themselves have forced him to do so; but Maitreya sees the growing pangs of his friend and informs him that Vasantasenā intends to pay him a visit that evening possibly to demand something more. Cārudatta remarks that she shall go away satisfied.

At this stage Kumbhīlaka, a servant of Vasantasenā, appears at the gate of the grove of trees where Cārudatta and Maitreya are sitting, and finding it closed; throws small pebbles at the latter just to catch his attention. It is only after some time that Maitreya notices Kumbhīlaka and after exchange of proper greeting asks why he has come in heavy rains. Then after a lot of humorous exchange of questions and answers he tells Maitreya that Vasantasenā is coming. The news is then conveyed by him to Cārudatta himself who bestows on him his mantle. The ceṭa goes ways satisfied ; and Maitreya once again tells Cārudatta that Vasantasena must be coming only to demand something more ; and Cārudatta decides to satisfy her.

Now Vasantasenā is seen on her way to Cārudatta she is accompanied by viṭa; and they between them describe the rainy phenomenon and its effect on Vasantasenā in particular. As they approach Cārudatta's house, Viṭa gives her some advice as to how she should win Cārudatta's love and asks somebody there to tell Cārudatta of Vasantasenā's arrival. Vasantasenā then politely sends him away and asks Maitreya where the gambler (Cārudatta) was. He directs her to the grove

of trees, entering which she strikes Cārudatta with flowers and asks him whether he was happy. Cārudatta welcomes her and when they are all seated, he asks his friend to bring two fine garments for Vasantasenā. But the latter's *ceṭī* undertakes to do the job; and Maitreya with Cārudatta's permission asks Vasantasenā why she has come to Cārudatta in such heavy rains and at such a dark hour. And when the *ceṭī* tells him that they desire to know the value of the necklace, Maitreya reiterates his old idea in that connection to Carudatta. But the *ceṭī* continues adding that her mistress has lost it in gambling and that Cārudatta should, therefore, accept the golden casket till the necklace is traced. Maitreya recognises the ornaments and Cārudatta also is happy to know this. But Maitreya, with Cārudatta's consent, now asks from where they got the ornaments; and is told something in the ear which he conveys into the ear of his friend. Cārudatta now wishes to give a ring to the *ceṭī* but is abashed to find his fingers vacant. This deepens Vasantasenā's love for him. Here again Cārudatta describes the evils of poverty ; but his friend appeases him and strikes a humorous note by requesting Vasantasenā to return his bath-towel (in which the ornaments were wrapped by him). Vasantasenā then tells Cārudatta that he has wronged her by sending her the necklace ; but Cārudatta gives his defence by referring to the adage that poverty is the source of all calamities. Maitreya then asks Vasantasenā whether she intended to stay there that night and draws Cārudatta's attention to the renewingly extensive showers of rain. Cārudatta then describes the phenomenon in glowing terms as a result of which Vasantasenā, extremely overpowered by amour, embraces him and he

is at the height of happiness. Maitreya here curses the rain for frightening Vasantasenā ; but Cārudatta corrects him, pointing out what good the rain has done to him that day ; and then they all go into the house.

ACT VI

This act begins with the appearance on the stage of Cārudatta's *ceṭī*, wondering why Vasantasenā is not yet awakened. Then Vasantasenā is seen in an apartment in the house asleep, her body covered with a garment. The *ceṭī* goes in and awakens her, saying that it is morning. Vasantasenā walking up asks where Cārudatta was, and is told that he has gone to the *Puṣpakaraṇḍaka* garden leaving orders for Vardhamānaka to take her there early in the morning. Vasantasenā then asks the maid whether she has been in the inner chamber of the house and whether the servants there resent it ; and is told that she has entered not only the inner chamber of the house, but even the hearts of all there and that they would feel sorry when she goes away. Then Vasantasenā presses the maid to take the necklace and give it to Dhūtā who, however, gracefully returns it with the remark that she has a great ornament in her husband.

At this stage appears Radanikā with Cārudatta's son Rohasena, crying for a golden toy-cart instead of the one made of clay. In her attempt to appease him Radanikā comes to Vasantasenā who welcomes them and is glad to know that the boy was Cārudatta's son. She is, however, pained to learn that he is crying for a golden cart like his neighbour and tries to appease him. The boy naturally asks who she was and refuses to believe that she was his mother, laden with gold as she was. Vasantasenā at once takes off her ornaments saying that

now she has become his mother, and offers them to him for making a golden cart. The boy, however, accepts them only when Vasantasenā wipes off her tears with a promise not to shed tears any further. Radanikā then goes away with the boy.

Just at this stage comes Vardhamānka requesting Radanikā to inform Vasantasenā that a veiled cart was ready at the side-door. Radanikā informs Vasantasenā accordingly and asks Vardhamānka to wait till Vasantasenā was doing her toilet. Vardhamānaka also, finding that he has forgotten to bring car-cushions, goes away with the car to fetch them while Vasantasenā began her toilet.

In the meanwhile there comes Sthāvaraka (Śakāra's *ceṭa*) with his master's car informing us that he is ordered by his master to take the cart quickly to the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden. The road is, however, all blocked with various cars and the *ceṭa* asks them to give way to Śakāra's cart. He at the same time notices somebody slinking away (like a gambler before a *sabhika*), but checks his curiosity and drives on. On the way he is requested by some one to give a turn to his wheel, which he agrees to do; and before going to help him he parks his cart at the side-door of a house nearby, which happens to be the house of Cārudatta. The sound of this cart is heard by the *ceṭī* in the house and she informs Vasantasenā about it. Vasantasenā, who is ready by this time, comes out and gets into the cart, asking the *ceṭī* to rest herself. Vasantasenā finds her right eye throbbing while she is mounting the cart, but does not mind it in her eagerness to see Cārudatta. By this time Sthāvaraka returns and starts his cart. He feels that the car is rather heavy; but accounts for it by

the fact that he is fatigued by turning the wheel. Just then is heard from behind the stage a proclamation that Āryaka has broken open the prison and absconded. Sthāvaraka, therefore, makes haste and goes away with great speed.

Now with a toss of curtain enters Āryaka veiled and fettered on one leg, describing how he was put into a secret dungeon from which he could get away only through Śarvilaka's aid. While he is thinking where to go, he hears a cart coming up. From the remark of the driver, Vardhamānaka, he also knows that the cart was going out of the town. He, therefore, gets into it from behind with his fetters jingling. Vardhamānaka also, thinking that it was Vasantasenā, asks her to mount from behind only, as the bulls were rather restive and when the jingling sound stops he concludes that Vasantasenā has got in, and starts the cart.

Now on the road is seen Vīraka calling his comrades to attention, and asking them to be at the various gates. With Candanaka then he proposes to survey the whole town from the top of the rampart there. Candanaka comes at his call, asks all the officers to be on the alert at their places and declares that one who has helped Āryaka to escape is under very evil stars. Vīraka tells Candanaka that Āryaka has sbsconded at early dawn and must have been helped by some one. Just at this point they see a veiled cart driving along ; and learn from the driver that it was taking Vasantasenā to Cārudatta in the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden and that the cart also belonged to Cārudatta. Candanaka is in favour of letting the cart go uninspected ; but Vīraka does not agree ; and ultimately at the latter's suggestion Candanaka undertakes to in-

spect it, asks the driver to raise up the yoke and goes in. There he finds Āryaka, who seeks protection which he promises to give. Deciding then to keep his word he tells Vīraka that he has seen the *ārya*, eh *āryā* Vasantasenā who resents our inspection on the way. Vīraka's suspicion is, however, roused and inspite of Candanaka's protests he resolves to inspect the car himself. Candanaka, then in order to save Āryaka, picks up a quarrel with Vīraka; they both abuse each other referring to their castes; and while Vīraka inspite of his protests essays to mount the cart for inspection, he drags him by the hair and kicks him with his feet. Vīraka thereon threatens to punish him in the court and goes away. Candanaka then gives a scimitar to Āryaka and instructs him to state that the cart has been inspected by Vīraka and Candanaka and as Āryaka was going away, requests him to remember him out of affection. Āryaka promises to do so: and Candanaka bids him good-bye and in view of recent scuffle with Vīraka, decides to join Āryaka with all his relatives.

ACT VII

Cārudatta and Maitreya are seen at the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden, the former wondering why Vardhamānaka is so late inspite of the direction given to him by Maitreya. While Cārudatta is having his own guesses in that connection Vardhamānaka appears with his cart with Āryaka therein hastening towards the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden. Knowing from Vardhamānaka's remark that he is going towards Cārudatta in the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden in his very cart, Āryaka after some hesitation decides at last to see Cārudatta personally. By this time the cart reaches the garden; and Cārudatta asks Vardhamānaka why he was so late. The latter tells him that it was because he had

to fetch the cushions which he had forgotten. At Cārudatta's suggestion then Maitreya goes forth to help Vasantasenā to alight and shouts out that it was Vasantasena and not Vasantasenā. Cārudatta takes this to be only a joke and decides to help Vasantasenā himself. As he goes to the cart, Āryaka sees him and feels sure of his safety. Cārudatta, however, wonders who he is and learns from him that he is Āryaka who had been imprisoned by the king. Cārudatta then promises to save him at any cost and asks the servant to remove his fetters. Āryaka, however, declares that he is now tied by stronger fetters of love. Maitreya does not appreciate all this ; and Āryaka also begs Cārudatta's pardon for having got into his cart. Cārudatta, however, declares it to be only a favour, and requests Āryaka to use his cart to get out of the imminent danger. Then they pay compliments to one another ; and ultimately Cārudatta asks Āryaka to get away quickly lest he should be re-captured. After Āryaka has left, Cārudatta directs his friend to throw off the fetters in an old well. Just at this moment his left eye throbs and he feels anxious about Vasantasenā. He then makes a move and finding a monk coming up, in one direction, he goes out in another and thus avoids the inauspicious omen.

ACT VIII

This act opens in the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden with a monk therein carrying his wet garment in his hand. He tells us that he would wash the rag in the lotus-tank in the garden and go away quickly. But he is noticed by Śakāra (on whom the garden is bestowed by the king) who asks him to stop. The monk is mightily afraid owing to Śakāra being notorious for his ill treatment of monks. Śakāra in the meanwhile comes up along with Viṭa and

begins beating the monk. Viṭa tries to stop him ; and the monk also praises him, but Śakāra misunderstands his words and is somehow passified by Viṭa. On knowing, however, that the monk has come there to wash his rag, he takes offence and desires to finish him off with one blow. Viṭa tries to save him on the ground of his having taken the order only recently. But the perverse Śakāra began beating him because he did not turn a monk at his very birth. He then pretends to consult with his heart and declares that the monk should die there and then : or he may go only on condition that he should throw a lump of water in mud, or throw mud in water without making it turbid. The monk begins to lament : but is interpreted by Viṭa as praising him, and while Śakāra asks him to continue, he does it and slips away.

Viṭa and Śakāra now left to themselves enjoy the beauty of the garden ; but Śakāra can't help thinking of Vasantasenā. It is about mid-day; and he wonders why Sthāvaraka, his man, has not yet come with his cart. He then sings to divert himself; and when Vita calls him a *gandharva*, he tells him what special care he has taken to cultivate and preserve his voice. 'But why has the *ceṭa* not come, as yet? ' he asks and is told by Viṭa that he would be coming up presently.

At this juncture Sthāvaraka is seen driving fast his cart with Vasantasenā, and expressing great concern at the idea of incurring the wrath of Śakāra for being so late. This makes Vasantasenā realise the mistake she has committed and fills her with fear. By this time the cart approaches the garden; and when Śakāra knows it, he asks his *ceta* to take it over the broken wall there and the *ceṭa* has to obey. Then Śakāra asks Viṭa to get into

the cart first; but rebukes him as lacking in manners when he actually tries to do so. Then he goes into the cart himself and comes out shouting that there was either a thief or a demoness in it. He then persuades Viṭa to see the *woman* in the cart, adding that the *ceṭa* is too timid for that. Viṭa looks into the cart and is grieved to see Vasantasenā there. But on knowing that she was there only through mistake, he promises to help her and tells Śakāra that there was really a demoness in the cart. But Sakāra is too shrewed to take it so easily. Viṭa then evades the point altogether and proposes to go to the town on foot and Śakāra apparently agrees. But the very next moment he changes his mind and declares that he must go in his cart only. Viṭa thereon changes his mind and tells Śakāra that Vasantasenā was in the cart and that she has come to sport with him. Śakāra at once tries to appease her by falling at her feet; but she kicks him with her feet. Being enraged by this he asks Sthāvaraka from where he has brought her; and on knowing that she was there only through mistake, he at once orders her to get out. He even rushes forth to drag her by the hair. but Viṭa stops him and, Vasantasenā gets out of the cart. Now Śakāra thinks of murdering her and tries to persuade Vita to do it for him. Finding him too timid for the job, he tries *ceṭa* who also refuses to agree even against sound beating. Śakāra then sends away the *ceṭa* and himself tries to murder Vasantasenā. But Viṭa prevents him seizing him by the neck. Śakāra then plays a trick and requests Viṭa to go and bring the *ceṭa* back and further adds that Vasantasenā does not accept his suit because he is present there. Viṭa goes some distance and hides himself to see what Śakāra does. And when he finds Śakāra actually trying to win

over Vasantasenā, he goes away. Śakāra's attempt to propitiate Vasantasenā fails miserably and she rebukes him, adding that Cārudatta is in her heart so that she naturally remembers him. Śakāra threatens to kill her and also Cārudatta in her heart and challenges Cārudatta to save her. Vasantasenā says that he would save her if he at all sees her there. This is too much for Śakāra to bear who now actually begins beating her; and while she is repeatedly offering her bow to Cārudatta, he strangles her to swooning. He exults at this brave deed of his and is sorry that his parents are not there to witness it. Then he goes some distance and stands there expecting Viṭa to return.

In the meanwhile Viṭa comes back with the *ceṭa* whom he has reconciled. On his way back he notices a falling tree crushing a woman under it, and is anxious for Vasantasenā. As they come they are welcomed by Śakāra; and Viṭa asks him to return his deposit (viz. Vasantasenā). After some dissimulation he plainly tells Viṭa of what he has done and also points out to her corpse. Viṭa swoons; but is soon revived by the *ceṭa* who now blames himself for having brought her there at all. Viṭa then feels that Śakāra might try to put the blame off himself and is about to go away, when Śakāra seizes him and proposes to share the guilt. But when Viṭa refuses to agree, he throws the whole blame on him and challenges him to stand before the king, his brother-in-law. Viṭa, however, draws his sword in reply and Śakāra allows him to go. He then goes away to join Śarvilaka and others.

Now Śakāra, playing a trick on *ceṭa*, promises to give him his ornaments and asks him to go away with the cart and wait for him in the top-terrace-room of his mansion

When *ceṭa* is gone, he covers the body of Vasantasenā with withered dry leaves and decides to suppress all evidence by captivating *ceṭa* in fetters on his terrace, and lodging a complaint in the court against Cārudatta for Vasantasenā's murder. But as he moves out he sees a monk and hence in order to avoid him he goes away jumping over the broken wall.

Now enters a monk with a toss of curtain. He has washed his garment and wishes to dry it by spreading it over the heap of dry leaves that he notices there. He at the same time is heard saying that even *svarga* he can't relish until he is able to return the good done to him by Vasantasenā. Just then he feels as if the leaves were breathing and to his wonder he sees a hand coming out of them. He recognises the hand, knows from Vasantasenā that she wants water, and for want of any better alternative squeezes his garment over her. Vasantasenā revives and gets up. The monk fans her with the skirts of his garment; and disclosing his identity to her, asks her how she was there in that condition. Vasantasenā only tells him that it is the lot of a courtesan. Then the monk asks her to get up and suggests that she should rest herself in a convent nearby with a nun and go home when she was all right. Vasantasenā accepts the suggestion and goes away with the monk.

ACT IX

This act begins with the appearance of Śodhanaka on the stage telling us that he is asked by the authorities to arrange the seats in the court-hall. So saying he enters the court-hall and while he is doing his job, he espies Śakāra coming up. To avoid him he stands in a corner of the hall.

Then comes up Śakāra who after some efforts remembers that he has come to the court-hall to accuse Cārudatta of Vasantasenā's murder. He goes to the hall and finding that the judge has not yet come, waits outside on the *maidan*.

In the meanwhile the judge comes up along with the *śreṣṭhī* and the *kāyastha* and others. He explains to them the difficulty of his task and receives in return a compliment from them. Then they enter the court-hall and the judge asks Śodhanaka to see if there was any plaintiff. He goes out and finds Śakāra as one and tells the judge accordingly. Taking it as an ill omen, the judge sends word to Śakāra that his case will not be heard till the next day. Śākara, however, sends word in reply that he would get the judge dismissed and another one appointed through the king. This threat has its own effect and the judge calls Śakāra and agrees to take up his case. This naturally encourages Śakāra, who now thinks that he can compel the judge to do anything he likes. After preliminary greetings in his peculiar fashion, he takes his seat on the ground and tells the judge that when he had gone to the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden the other day he saw the dead body of a woman–-it was Vasantasenā– who must have been strangled for her ornaments by some pauper, *not by him*. The judge here asks the *kāyastha* to note down the words as a matter for consideration. Śakāra, however, sets the matter right by telling that he meant to say that he saw it himself; and wipes off the words written by the kāyastha. This, he adds, he guessed from the vacant limbs of the corpse. The judge decides that the case depends on Vasantasenā's mother and she is sent for. As she comes the judge tells her that legal procedure

demands to know where her daughter was and what is the name of her friend. The latter tells that her daughter has gone to Cārudatta ; and the judge asks kāyastha to make a note of this, and sends for Cārudatta specially instructing Śodhanaka to be polite with him. Śodhanaka comes with Cārudatta who has several ill omens on his way, but who has firm faith in deities. Approaching the court he describes its grandeur. But as he is going in, his head strikes against the panel and his left eye throbs. On entering the court-hall he greets all and the judge asks Śodhanaka to offer him a seat. Śakāra protests ; but ultimately connives at it. The judge then asks Cārudatta whether he has any connection with the daughter of the old lady there. Cārudatta bows to her and she also appreciates the choice of her daughter. The judge repeats his question and Cārudatta with some hesitation admits his friendship with a *gaṇikā* adding that it has nothing to do with his character. Being then told that the information was demanded by legal procedure, he desires to know with whom he has to deal ; and Śakāra, greeting him as a woman-killer, tells him that he was the plaintiff. The judge then asks him where Vasantasenā was ; and Cārudatta can say nothing more than that she has gone home. Here Śakāra repeats his charge against him ; and even the judge is not prepared to believe in the plaintiff's story. Śakāra, therefore, openly accuses the judge of partiality and is strongly rebuked by him. Vasantasenā's mother narrates how Cārudatta gave a very costly necklace for the sake of the stolen deposit of ornaments and wonders whether such a man can commit a murder for ornaments. The judge now asks whether Vasantasenā went on foot or in a cart ; and Carudatta pleads ignorance since she went home during his absence from home.

Just at this stage Vīraka, smarting under the insult heaped on him by Candanaka, comes to the court and narrates the whole story without giving out the name of Cārudatta at first. But when he is asked as to whose cart it was, he tells that it was Cārudatta's cart, carrying Vasantasenā to sport with Cārudatta in the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden according to the driver's statement. The judge feels sorry at this news going against Cārudatta, and askes Vīraka to see whether there was any corpse of a woman in that garden. Vīraka does accordingly and returns saying that he did find a corpse there which with its tresses of hair and hands and legs could be recognized to be of a woman. The judge now is extremely sorry and asks Cārudatta to give out the truth. He indirectly denies the charge. But Śakāra now seriously objects to Cārudatta retaining his seat and Cārudatta has to give it up. Śakāra is glad at the success of his plan so far; and asks Cārudatta to admit his guilt. He, however, only repeats his previous statement and wonders why Maitreya has not as yet returned from Vasantasenā's house where he has gone to return the ornaments given by her to Rohasena.

Maitreya now appears on the stage with the ornaments going to Vasantasenā. On the way from Rebhila he comes to know of Cārudatta being summoned to the court; and instead of going to Vasantasenā first, he decides to go to the court and see his friend. Entering the court-hall and after proper greeting he asks where his friend was; and finds him highly dejected. Cārudatta tells him how Śakāra has accused him of Vasantasenā's murder, on hearing which Maitreya is all wrath and asks the people there whether such a thing is ever possible and at the same time threatens Śakāra to break his

head into a hundred pieces for saying such things about his friend. Śakāra in anger refers to the judge pointing out that he is concerned not with him but with Cārudatta and hurls an abuse at him. Then ensues a quarrel between the two and the ornaments drop down from under the armpit of Maitreya. Śakāra at once seizes them and declares that they were the very ornaments for which the crime has been committed ; and all present there hang their heads down.

Maitreya suggests that Cārudatta should give out the plain facts of the matter ; but the latter argues that none would believe them and they would be revealing his pitiable condition. Vasantasenā's mother is asked to see the ornaments and she tries to save Cārudatta by saying that they were similar to her daughter's, but not the same. But Cārudatta himself declares that they belonged to Vasantasenā ; but he is not able to explain how he got them. This rouses greater suspicion and Cārudatta is asked to state the truth on pain of whipping ; and he feels constrained to admit the guilt. Śakāra now suggests capital punishment for the culprit. The judge also agrees and asks the officers to take him away. Vasantasenā's mother at this stage tries to intervene on behalf of Cārudatta ; but without any success. She then goes away weeping when she sees Cārudatta seized by the officers there. Śakāra also goes satisfied at his success. The judge then addresses Cārudatta saying that he is to decide the case and the final decision lies with the king. He then sends Śodhanaka to the king with a recommendation not to sentence Cārudatta to death but only to banish him with all his belongings. The king, however, confirms the death sentence and orders Cārudatta to be taken through the streets of the town with those very orna-

ments on his neck to the southern cemetery only to be impaled. Cārudatta only says that the sentence is quite rash; and requests Maitreya to convey his last respects to his mother and look after his son. But Maitreya has no desire to survive Cārudatta. So Cārudatta expresses a desire to see his son. Maitreya agrees to do his desire, but is driven away from there. The officers all go away and Cārudatta goes along with Śodhanaka exhorting king Pālaka.

ACT X

The last act presents to us Cārudatta followed by two caṇḍālas who declare that they are taking him to the execution ground. He, on the way, refers to the capricious nature of fate and man's impotence before it. The caṇḍālas remind the public that death of a good man and such other matters should not be witnessed. One of the caṇḍālas wonders whether it was raining with a rain-bow in the absence of clouds and is told by the other that the women-folk are shedding tears for Cārudatta. Cārudatta is touched to the quick by this. By this time they are at the first proclamation station and the caṇḍālas beat the drum and proclaim the crime of Cārudatta and the sentence passed on him by the king. Carudatta can't bear the sound of the charge and covers up his ears. The procession moves on and caṇḍālas declare that rare indeed are the persons to help the fallen. Cārudatta repeats the same idea and the procession is on the highway.

Cārudatta now requests the caṇḍālas to allow him a sight of his son. They agree and Maitreya and Rohasena (whose voice is heard from behind the stage) come up through the crowd. As they are coming Maitreya tells

Rohasena of his father's plight. Cārudatta after a little thought gives his son his sacred thread which he describes as an ornament of a Brāhmaṇa, passing gold and jewels. The procession moves further and Rohasena asks the caṇḍālas where they were taking his father. They tell him they were not caṇḍālas at heart and that they are taking Cārudatta to the place of execution in obedience to royal behest. He then requests them to kill him for his father. Maitreya also makes a similar offer. But Cārudatta does not allow it. They are now at the second station and the Caṇḍalas beat the drum and also the proclamation as before.

Sthāvaraka, captivated on the terrace, hears this proclamation and tries to attract the attention of the people by shouting out the truth to them. But finding it to be of no avail, he slips down a broken lattice in the terrace and finds that he is not only not injured but his fetters also are shattered. Then quickly going in the direction of the procession, he discloses the facts of the case to the caṇḍālas and the people there, adding that he had been captivated by his master on the terrace of his house lest he should give out the truth. Just at this point Śakāra stands out in his house exulting in the success of his plan and is struck to see his *ceṭa* there. Suspecting his intentions, Śakāra gets down from his house and tries to bring the *ceṭa* back. Finding him unwilling to accompany him, he plays a trick by offering a bracelet to the *ceṭa* who, of course, refuses to accept it. Śakāra, however, tells the people that the *ceṭa* has stolen the bracelet and has had a good flogging also for it. Thus the tables are turned against the poor *ceṭa*; and while he is paying respects to Cārudatta he is driven away from there. Now Śakāra hastens the caṇḍālas to execute Cārudatta and even

suggests that he may be killed along with his son. Cārudatta, on hearing this, advises his son to go with his mother to an *āśrama* far beyond the danger due to his crime, and asks Maitreya to take him away. The latter repeats his desire not to survive him. But Cārudatta says it was not right for him to think so. Śakāra again asks the caṇḍālas to kill Cārudatta as well as his son ; but they refuse to do so. They are now at the third station and beat the drum and repeat the proclamation. But Śakāra insists that Cārudatta should proclaim it himself, and Cārudatta under compulsion, does accordingly. The caṇḍālas then cast lots to decide whose turn it was to execute ; and the one who got the turn said that he would wait for some time in obedience to his father's instructions, so that some incident might lead to the rescue of the accused. Śakāra is making haste and the Caṇḍālas apologetically ask Cārudatta to remember whatever he wanted to. He is then shown the southern cemetery where he is to be impaled. He is overcome by depression at the thought of an undeserving end ; but the caṇḍālas try to appease him by telling him that such indeed are the ways of fate. The next station has come by this time ; and the caṇḍalas repeat the proclamation once again.

Now appear on the stage Vasantasenā and the monk in excitement. Vasantasenā desires to be taken to Cārudatta's house and the monk decides to go by the highway. As they are on the highway they notice there a great noise and crowd and are curious to know what it was about. In the meanwhile the caṇḍālas repeat the proclamation at the fifth station and the monk knows the danger Cārudatta is in. He conveys it to Vasantasenā and they make haste. In the meanwhile caṇḍāla has asked Cāru-

datta to be ready ; and as he was about to strike, the axe drops down from his hand. This he takes to be a good omen and he appeals to the deity of the *Sahya* mountain to save Cārudatta, and the caṇḍāla race as a whole. The other caṇḍāla then proposes to obey the sentence to the letter and actually put Cārudatta on the stake. But before they have done it, the monk and Vasantasenā ask them to wait, the latter also declaring that she was Vasantasenā for whose sake Cārudatta has found himself in this plight. The caṇḍālas are happy that they have not already executed Cārudatta and go away to convey the news to the king in the sacrificial court. At this stage Śakāra sees Vasantasenā and runs away ; but a caṇḍāla returns just then saying that the king has ordered the murderer of Vasantasenā to be executed and runs after Śakāra. Cārudatta wonders whether Vasantasenā has really arrived there and is happy to learn that she was really Vasantasenā and declares that the *vadhya marks* have now become marriage decorations for him. Vasantasenā then reveals how she was strangled by Śakāra and how she was saved by the monk there. The monk then tells Cārudatta that he was none but his old shampooer, Saṁvāhaka, and after narrating all his story, tells how he was saved by Vasantasenā.

Now all of a sudden comes up Śarvilaka who declares that Āryaka has been crowned and that he would now rescue Cārudatta from the danger he was in. He sees the crowd in front of him and is glad to learn that Vasantasenā as well as Cārudatta is alive. He is rather abashed to show his face to Cārudatta; but makes bold to approach him and greet him and reveal his identity as one who stole away the ornaments from his house. He further tells Cārudatta that Āryaka whom he was instrumental in

saving, has killed Pālaka, and as a crowned king is requesting him to accept his first gift of the territory of Kuśāvatī on the Veṇā. At this stage Śakāra is brought there a captive before Cārudatta whom he abjectly requests to save him. When Śarvilaka asks Cārudatta how Śakāra should be dealt with, he first makes sure that his will shall be done and then to the amazement of all declares that he should be set free. Śarvilaka also is wonderstruck and leaves the place.

Just then Candanaka is heard to declare from behind the curtain that Dhūtā setting aside her son was trying to enter fire inspite of the sorrowing and tearful crowd. On being asked by Śarvilaka, he further tells that being overpowered by sorrow Dhūtā would not listen to him at all though he tried to tell her that Cārudatta is alive. At this Cārudatta falls in a swoon ; and Śarvilaka is now in a fix. But Vasantasenā revives Cārudatta and they all proceed towards Dhūtā.

Now Dhūtā appears on the stage, bent on immolating herself even against the entreaties of Rohasena and Maitreya. She requests *ceṭī* and Maitreya to look after her son. But finding them prepared to die, she at last asks her son to compose himself since Cārudatta is no longer alive to do so. Just then Cārudatta steps forth declaring that he would do it personally, and Dhūtā and Rohasena are all joy to see him there alive. Cārudatta asks Dhūtā what she was about to do even while he was yet alive and tries to prove her mistake by referring to the lotus-plant which never closes before the sun has set. Dhūtā simply says in reply that is exactly why the lotus plant is called *acetana* (which she was not). Maitreya is struck by the efficacy of chastity. Cārudatta receives

Maitreya as well as Radanikā. Dhūtā receives Vasantasenā; and Śarvilaka, on behalf of the new king, bestows on Vasantasenā the status of *Vadhū*. Then in deference to the wishes of Cārudatta the monk, Sthāvaraka, Candanaka and even Śakāra are amply rewarded ; and in reply to a question of Śarvilaka Cārudatta recounts all the good things that he has already got and adds that if at all any thing must be desired he would seek all good to all as described in the Bharata-vākya.

CHAPTER III

A CRITICAL APPRECIATION

Nāndī

In obedience to the rules[1] of Sanskrit Dramaturgy Śūdraka has begun his play with a *Nāndī* comprising *two* verses in the *sragdharā* and the *anuṣṭubh* metres (thus having eight *padas* or lines), invoking blessings from *Śambhu's samādhi* and *Nīlakaṇṭha's dark throat adorned by the charming bright arm of Gaurī*. The *nāndī*, it must be observed, forms the last (and the only extant) portion of an elaborate ceremony called *Pūrvaraṅga* calculated to secure an unhampered representation of the play. The definition[2] requires that a *nāndī*, beside invoking blessings from some deity, should also be suggestive of the main points of the plot. Commentators have always taxed their ingenuity to show that every Sanskrit playwright has conformed to this definition, though the fact may perhaps be otherwise. Nīlakaṇṭha and Gaurī of our *nāndī* are said to be suggestive of the hero and the heroine of our play; their union is suggested by the second half of that verse; the cloud and lightning convey the idea of the storm; and the dark and the bright complexions remind us of the similar modes of life adopted by the wicked and the good respectively. We may go a bit further and suggest that the author, by referring to god Śiva by the names Nīlakaṇṭha and Śambhu, is perhaps suggesting that the god will ultimately suppress all evil and make all happy just as he did it for the gods by swallowing the deadly poison.

Prologue

Nāndī is followed by prologue (called *āmukha*[3] or *prastāvanā*) which consists of a striking conversation which the stage-manager (*sūtradhāra*) holds with his wife (*naṭī*) or *vidūṣaka*, or *pāripārśvaka* on some pertinent matter which at the same time is suggestive of the plot of the play to some extent. It introduces the author and the play by giving their names and other details, rouses the interest of the spectators and catches their attention by some device, and ultimately introduces the play proper. The prologue of our play will be found to be quite upto the mark in all these respects. It gives us not only the name of the play and its author and his accomplishments, but also a fine idea, in a nutshell, of the main plot and the main points of the other episodes. But our interest is roused when we see the *sūtradhāra*, after his music, turning homeward and giving a glowing description of the nice preparations going on there. The humour in the conversation that follows serves to heighten our interest; and we are at last taken into the play proper by the introduction of Maitreya on the stage.

There are, according to Sanskrit dramaturgy, five varieties[4] of *prastāvanā* which it is not always easy determine beyond doubt. Thus the *prastāvanā* of our play is sometimes[5] said to be of the *pravṛttaka variety* as in the *Uttara-rāmacarita*. It must, however, be observed that the Sūtradhāra in the *Uttara-rāmacarita* actually tells[6] us that he has now become *āyodhyika* and *tadānīntana*, and hence a contemporary of the *dramatis personæ*. That *prastāvanā* is, threfore, rightly classed as of the *pravṛttaka* variety. In our play, however, no such statement is made by the sūtradhāra. He only says that he would now

speak in *prākṛta* which by itself does not make him a contemporary of the *dramatis personæ*. Our *prastāvanā*, therefore, can't be of the *pravṛttaka*[7] variety. On the other hand we see that Maitreya is introduced on the stage by the remark '*Eṣa Maitreyah* &c.' which is the characteristic of the *prayogātiśaya*[8] variety.

Let us now note a few noteworthy circumstances about the prastāvanā of the *Mrcchakaṭika*. And the first is its close resemblance to these of the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* and the *Cārudatta*. This latter is particularly interesting because the resemblance between the two plays is noticeable all through. This has, indeed, created the problem of the relation between the two plays with stalwarts arrayed on either side. It may be noted here that our play (with the exception of the *Cārudatta*) is perhaps unique in making the *sūtradhāra* speak in prakrit; and it may not be far from right to conclude that Śūdraka has made his *sūtradhāra* speak in the prakrit probably in conformity to a similar phenomenon which he found in the *Cārudatta*, that he was enlarging. The next thing to note is the suspicious nature of verses 3–7 which pay a glowing tribute to the qualities of head, heart and physique possessed by the author and add that he entered fire after enjoying a life of a hundred years and ten days. That the author himself should record the exact date and manner of his own death can't but rouse our suspicion even if we connive at the grammatical difficulty presented by the verbs *babhūva*, *cakāra*, and the participle *praviṣṭaḥ*. There can, therefore, be little doubt that these stanzas are not genuine.

Lastly we may note how in view of the definition of a prastāvanā, attempts have been made to show that the prologue of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* (keeping out the stanzas

discussed above) is suggestive of the plot. Thus it is said that by the expression *saṁvidhānaka* repeated thrice, Śūdraka is hinting that his plot is very striking indeed; and that the description of *nava saṁvidhānaka* suggests Śakara's attempt to crush Cārudatta, the victim's garland thrown on Cārudatta's neck, and five desirable achievements mentioned at X. 57 or the various activities in Vasantasenā's house. Similarly the curse uttered by the *sūtradhāra* on his wife is interpreted as suggesting the calamity in store for Vasantasenā; and the statement '*Kṣudhayā akṣiṇī khaṭakhaṭāyete*' is said to suggest the irrelevant talk of Śakāra. We need not take all this ingenuity too seriously; and yet should note that Śūdraka has purposely introduced in this prologue two names: (i) Jūrṇavṛadha, whose gift to Cārudatta viz. the *jasmine-scented mantle* is to play a very important part in the play; and (ii) King Pālaka whose rash actions, like the one noted in the simile where he is mentioned[9], are to hasten the revolution and his downfall and death.

ACT I

An act in a Sanskrit drama is not divided into scenes as in a modern drama, and yet it may be observed that Act I of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* represents a series of scenes, the action in some of which is taking place inside the house of Cārudatta while that in the others outside the house in its precincts or on the highway adjoining it and extending as far as the house of Vasantasenā. The sūtradhāra's reference shows that Maitreya is going along a street of Ujjayinī and Maitreya himself tells us that he is going to see Cārudatta to hand him over the *jasmine-scented mantle* sent for him by his friend Jūrṇavṛddha. He also refers to the by-gone days of prosperity and happiness he has

enjoyed during Cārudatta's prosperity and his present plight due to the bad days which now have befallen Cārudatta. This soliloquy of Maitreya not only gives us an idea of the hero's past and present circumstances and introduces him on the stage, but at the same time very innocently brings on the stage the mantle whose dramatic importance can hardly be exaggerated. It may casually be noted here that Śūdraka very often makes some character on the stage describe in details the other character that is about to enter and thus avoids the use of long and detailed stage directions as in the modern drama[10].

Cārudatta is seen coming from inside his house, expressing his sad thoughts about the effects of his poverty, and is greeted by Maitreya who enters from outside. The whole of this scene is laid just inside Cārudatta's house. Throughout this scene we see Cārudatta in a very dejected mood and Maitreya trying to appease and cheer him up thinking that he is sorry for the adversity which has befallen him at present. Maitreya, however, represents only a shallow view of the matter and has not the capacity to fathom the depths of Cārudatta's heart. Cārudatta has, therefore, to repeat more than once that he is sorrowing not so much for the loss of wealth *per se* as for the evil effects thereof. For poverty is the source of all calamities, estranges even best friends, and is worse than even death. This view of Cārudatta about poverty only reveals his utter absence of self-interest, his consideration for others, and consequently his magnanimity. It also ironically enough makes him shadow forth the calamities that are to befall him. Cārudatta's devout piety is also brought out in the scene when in refutation of the objection raised by his friend he

remarks that offering oblations etc., as obligatory rites, must be performed with full faith and without any scepticism[11]. Maitreya then shifts his ground quite naturally; and here again we see how the new ground[12] set forth by Maitreya also serves to suggest the entrance of the dramatis personæ and also the place and time of the scene to follow.

Before, however, the next scene begins, Śūdraka has shown his skill by making Cārudatta ask his friend to wait till he performs his meditation. It may be observed that the action of the third scene below is a direct continuation of the first and at the same time is closely connected with the action of the second. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary to bring the second scene at this stage. But it would be unnatural and also awkward if Cārudatta and his friend remain on the stage idle and dumb with no suitable excuse till the action of the scene is over. Śūdraka has cleverly avoided this difficulty by keeping Cārudatta engaged in meditation which naturally explains his silence and hence also that of his friend, and at the same time deepens our impression of the piety of Cārudatta. Now Cārudatta and his friend are inside the house while Vasantasenā, Śakāra &c. are on the highway adjoining the house. This naturally demands some stage arrangement dividing the stage into two parts in such a way that persons on both these will be visible to the spectators and yet would not be so to one another.

The second scene which commences with the appearance of Vasantasenā pursued by Śakāra and his viṭa and ceṭa is laid on the road from her house upto that of Cārudatta; and presents a good contrast to the scene that has just ended. This scene clearly brings out the peculiar traits of Śakāra, his speech and mannerisms.

The speeches of viṭa and ceṭa relieve the monotony which would otherwise have marred the scene, and at the same time give us a glimpse into their characters. But the more important purpose served by this scene is the introduction of the heroine and the fact that she is in love with Cārudatta since the Love-festival. Just in keeping with his character, Śakāra is made to warn viṭa that he should take care lest Vasantasenā should slip away in the dark into the house of that beggarly Cārudatta nearby with whom she has fallen in love. Vasantasenā naturally takes advantage of this and actually slips away from her pursuers and gets at the side-door which, however, is closed.

Just at this stage Cārudatta's meditation is over, he again asks his friend to offer the oblation which he now agrees to do and starts to go out with Radanikā. As soon as the door is opened Vasantasenā who is standing there, extinguishes the lamp and gets into the house. Maitreya, however, not realising what has happened,[13] asks Radanikā to go out at the side-door and he himself goes into the house to fetch the lamp re-lighted. This small incident has helped the action on either side. For outside the house it leads to the seizing of Radanikā by Śakāra and inside it has led to the introduction of Vasantasenā to Cārudatta and the depositing of her ornaments with him.

The scene that follows reveals to us the cleverness of Śakāra in arguing in self-interest, Maitreya's pious indignation and simplicity, and viṭa's sagacity, appreciation of Cārudatta as also his low estimate of Śakāra. Here we also get good humour arising out of the exchange of questions and answers which serve as a good foil to the serious threat that Śakāra sends to Cārudatta before

the scene comes to a close. Little does the spectator dream at this stage how significant the words '*āmaraṇāntikam vairam*' are. We may also note the peculiar art of Sūdraka in introducing matters bit by bit. Thus in one scene he has introduced the past prosperity (and the present adversity) of Cārudatta, in the next we are acquainted with an incident resulting in the love of Vasantasenā for Cārudatta, and now he has arranged the matters in such a way that this love would be conveyed to Cārudatta in the very hearing of Vasantasenā, along with the fact of her being pursued by Śakāra.

Then follows the last scene of the act which is a continuation of the short scene after the second. This scene again gives a good idea of the great regard of Radanikā and Maitreya for Cārudatta. By making Cārudatta mistake Vasantasenā for Radanikā and making him throw his mantle towards her for covering his son and asking her to bring him in, Sūdraka has also displayed his dramatic skill. For the scent[14] of the mantle helps to excite Vasantasenā's love-longing and his order to take his son inside heightens that feeling by making her realise the difficulty thereof. This incident, moreover, naturally leads Cārudatta to apologise to Vasantasenā who returns it by her apologies for intrusion and also emboldens her to propose to deposit her ornaments with him with a very plausible excuse. It is only in the second act that we realise the significance of Vasantasenā's remark here '*Caturo madhuraś cāyam upanyāsaḥ*'. It also gives Vasantasenā an opportunity to request Cārudatta to escort her home which brings them all the closer. The scene and the act also ends with Maitreya accepting the instruction of Cārudatta that Vardhamānaka and he should take care of the ornaments by day and by night respectively.

Act I thus has brought before us four important characters, the hero, the heroine, Maitreya and Śakāra, and some of the minor characters with their salient features and conveyed to us the main point of the story; *viz*. Vasantasenā is in love with Cārudatta, Śakāra, out of lust, desires to secure her, but as she has slipped into the former's house, he has now turned his deadly enemy. We are thus acquainted here with an incident frought with possibilities and also with two things *prāvāraka* and *suvarṇabhāṇḍa* so innocently introduced that their dramatic importance is hardly even dreamt of at this stage.

ACT II

This act presents a striking parallel to Act I; for it also contains a series of scenes the action in some of which is laid inside the house of Vasantasenā while that in the others outside her house in the precincts, and the road adjoining it. The scenes also are arranged in the same way as those in the last act, and therefore, require the same type of stage-arrangement.

The ceṭī's appearance on the atage serves the purpose of a lengthy stage-direction which would otherwise have been necessary for acquainting the spectators with the whole situation. But at the same time she has to convey an errand to Vasantasenā whose reply shows how she is affected by love-longing. Her absent-mindedness exposed by the question *tatastataḥ* all of a sudden gives Madanikā a peep into her heart and she cleverly enough elicits from her the fact that the first sight of Cārudatta at the *love temple garden* has struck her with love for him, his utter poverty being an additional ground to confirm her choice. It is here that we get the real

significance of Vasantasenā's depositing her ornaments with Cārudatta in Act I; for she is as yet afraid of offering her love to him directly lest she should lose him altogether.

As already noted before Śūdraka observes the rule '*Nāsūcitasya pātrasya praveśaḥ syāt kadācana*' and here we find him doing it by making some one behind the curtain call out to the gambler (his name is *saṁvāhaka* i. e. a shampooer) who is to enter with a toss of curtain. This scene introduces a good variation in every respect and is brimmingly faithful to the life it represents on the stage. It brings before us four persons: three gamblers and a gambling master. Two of the gamblers present a good contrast to one another and represent the difference between a confirmed gambler and an ordinary one. The gambling-master also is true to his counterpart in the actual life and on the whole we get a good idea from this scene about gambling and gambler's life in several details. The whole scene is very lively and full of boisterous humour, scuffles and tricks characteristic of the life it represents. The most important matter to be noted in this scene, however, is the reference[15] it makes–the first direct[16] one in the play--to Āryaka, the *siddhādeśa* about him, and the fact that several revolutionaries have begun to cluster around him. The statement[17] of Saṁvāhaka at the end of this scene only serves to suggest that the scene is shifting from the street to inside Vasantasenā's house just beside the side-door. This takes place in two instalments: first by Saṁvāhaka escaping into the house, and secondly by Māthura and the gambler tracing his bleeding nose upto that house and waiting there just at the door. This shifting of the scene of action has been actually represented on the stage by means of two short

scenes instead of by stage-directions. The representation of such short scenes on the stage without disturbing the unity of action can be done only with complex stage arrangements to show the inside, and the precincts of the house and also the road adjoining it simultaneously in such a way that persons inside should be invisible to those outside and vice versa and at the same time both should be visible to the spectators without any difficulty.

The next scene acquaints us with the past history of the Saṁvāhaka and serves the purpose of bringing out clearly the intensity to which Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta has reached. But that is not all. It also contains the seed for further development; for this good turn done to Saṁvāhaka by Vasantasenā here does get a return at his hands towards the end of the play, though at this stage it is beyond the spectators even to imagine how this small incident would help the main plot. This scene is again intercepted by a short scene representing Madanikā handing over the bracelet to Māthura and his friend in repayment of Saṁvāhaka's dues. And then the scene is brought to a close with Saṁvāhaka requesting Vasantasenā to remember that he has turned a monk.[18] Śūdraka by emphasising this incident has suggested its high dramatic significance, which, however, can hardly be realised by the spectator at this stage.

The last scene of the act is introduced by the stage direction *nepathye kalakalaḥ* and Saṁvāhaka's remark concerning the same from which we know that there is some sensation caused by *Khuṇṭamoḍaka*, Vasantasenā's elephant, breaking loose; and the scene that follows satisfies our curiosity by supplying the details thereof. The episode of Karṇapūraka also has its own dramatic significance. It supplies another instance of Cārudatta's

magnanimity and appreciative nature which deepens Vasantasenā's love for him. It, moreover, marks a further march in the journey of the mantle which is recognized and identified by Vasantasenā on the strength of the jasmine scent; and the identification is further confirmed by the name thereon. The act is then brought to a close by Vasantasenā making a move with Madanikā to go up the terrace of her house to enjoy a look at Cārudatta while he would be passing that way.

Act II thus contains two episodes--of Saṁvāhaka and of Karṇapūraka--both of which have their own immediate purpose to serve no doubt, but which at the same time contain seeds of the further development of the plot as we realise when we see the part played by Saṁvāhaka (turned a monk) in the acts that follow.

ACT III

Act III, representing mainly the episode of Śarvilaka to be continued in the next act, falls into four main scenes with some short scenes at different intervals. Thus the act opens with a short introductory scene which represents Vardhamānaka as tired by waiting for Cārudatta and Maitreya to return from the musical performance that they have gone to attend. It is past mid-night; and he goes and sleeps in the outer quadrangle of Cārudatta's house. This scene has thus supplied to us the necessary information about the dramatis personæ to come on the stage and also suggested their entrance.

The next scene shows Maitreya and Cārudatta discussing the performance of Rebhila, and Maitreya expressing his dissent by quaint illustrations[19] quite in keeping with his character. The fact that the moon is setting at this time while it is referred to as rising about the same

time in Act I has its own bearing on the time analysis of the play which will be discussed in a later chapter. Before the scene comes to a close Maitreya while taking charge of the *suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa* from Vardhamānaka, in his natural disgust complains that the stealer of his sleep should not yet find a thief to steal it away.[20] Natural as this remark is in the case of Maitreya, it also suggests the entrance of Śarvilaka (a thief) on the stage.

The long soliloquy or rather monologue of Śarvilaka begins the next scene of this act. It is a sort of harangue on the art of thieving and would have become extremely dull, but for the action which Śarvilaka is doing all along. Śūdraka has made Maitreya speak out in his sleep and hand over the *suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa* to his friend (actually, of-course, to the thief) swearing by *go-kāmyā* and *Brāhmaṇa-kāmyā*- -which is only a natural effect of having had the pressure of the *bhāṇḍa* on his brains for a pretty long time. This *utsvapna speech* is also used later on in this very act to reveal to Cārudatta that the thief has stolen it away.[21] This scene also gives us the past history of Śarvilaka and also the motif[22] of the theft viz. his love with Madanikā, Vasantasenā's maid. Here is the seed of this incident contacting with and furthering the main plot as will be clear in the next act.

The following scene laid wholly inside Cārudatta's house shows Cārudatta grieving at the thought that the thief should have to go away from his house empty-handed,[23] then glad to know that he has stolen the *suvarṇa bhāṇḍa*,[24] and again falling in a swoon on being reminded that it was a *nyāsa*.[25] Maitreya, on the other hand, shows himself the practical man, that he is, advising his friend to deny altogether having received the deposit at all.[26] Cārudatta, however, is firm and would stick to the truth

at any cost and save his *cāritra*.[27] It is this strength, shown by him here and on several occasions elsewhere, that makes us admire him and acknowledge him as the hero[28] inspite of some short-comings that might be detected in him.

This scene is again intercepted by a short scene which brings before us Cārudatta's wife, Dhūtā, the ideal of a Hindu wife, who would care, even as her husband in this case, more for his *Cāritra* than for his mortal coils,[29] and would not spare any thing to save it when it was in danger of being clouded. The neck-lace, Dhūtā's *strīdhana*, like the *prāvāraka* and the *suvarṇa bhāṇḍa*, has its own dramatic significance and by its journey through more hands than one has very well displayed, with eloquent silence, the magnanimity of Dhūtā, Cārudatta and also Vasantasenā, and also the practical bent of mind possessed by Maitreya. For as soon as Maitreya presents it to Cārudatta on behalf of Dhūtā, after some brooding over this gift, he at once asks Maitreya to go away with it to Vasantasenā and hand it over to her in repayment of the ornaments she had deposited with him, inspite of his remonstrances[30] to the contrary. Cārudatta's magnanimity is also seen from his argument in this connection viz. that he is giving it away as the price of the confidence that Vasantasenā has kept in him in depositing the ornaments with him[31] and that he would not resort to falsehood and thus spoil his *cāritra*.[32]

The scenes in this act as we see are arranged almost on the same lines as in the last two acts, the action in them taking place alternately inside and outside the house of Cārudatta and that in the second last scene in the inner apartment of the same. Thus in Act I–II the stage represents the inside and the outside of the house and

the street adjoining it while in this act the road is replaced by the inner apartment, the other two remaining unaltered.

ACT IV

This act is the logical continuation of the last act and falls like it again into four main scenes. The short introductory scene only serves the purpose of a detailed stage direction like its compeers. The first scene brings out clearly Vasantasenā's love (intense love) for Cārudatta on the one hand and equally intense dislike for Śakāra on the other, through the painting and the mother's message and Vasantasenā's reply[33] to it respectively. We may here note the point of coincidence between this scene and the one that follows. Here Śakāra has sent ornaments with a desire to take away Vasantasenā but she refuses to go ; while in the next scene Vasantasenā actually receives the ornaments from Śarvilaka and presents to him Madanikā whom he then takes away with him.

In the second scene Śarvilaka gives us some information about himself, particularly how he has observed some code of honour[34] even in his low profession. While Śarvilaka is thus engaged outside, Madanikā is sent away by Vasantasenā to keep away the painting in her bedroom and fetch a fan. This gives Śarvilaka an opportunity to see Madanikā. Here again it must be noted that this can't be represented on the stage without causing a break in the unity of action in the absense of a well-equipped stage divisible into several sections as already suggested above.

Now follows a scene—a bi-focal scene we may call it—where Śarvilaka and Madanikā are conversing with one another and planning later on what the former

should do with the ornaments that he has stolen from the house of Cārudatta, and Vasantasenā, because she heard her name in their talk, concealing herself behind her lattices and overhearing their conversation. Here Vasantasenā sees and overhears the loving couple and knows their plans while they are not at all aware of this; and the spectator, of course, sees and hears all the three. This scene is highly important again because it brings out the noble traits of the character of Śarvilaka as also his impatience, jealousy, and consequent rashness which serve as a good foil to the sagacity, cool-headedness, and constancy or deep love of Madanikā. We are also struck with the novelty of the idea of the thief, who has stolen away the ornaments, himself turning into his messenger and returning the ornaments to the proper owner. It at the same time shows how confident Madanikā is about Cārudatta[35] and also how appreciative Vasantasenā is even of her servants.[36] The long vituperation[37] against women which Śarvilaka indulges in, almost without any break, may be all right in a poem; but has little justification in a drama and must be taken as a blemish in the dramatic art of the playwright.

The next scene is introduced by a proclamation behind the curtain about the imprisonment of Āryaka and exhorting all to be on their guard. This scene brings out another important trait in Śarvilaka's character viz. his love of and fidelity to his friend.[38] Here we see him as the leader of the revolution.[39] It is noticeable that the sub-plot, like the revolution itself, is taking steady roots through these stray references in the early acts of our play and is going to have its momentum later on, but never so strong as to overshadow the main plot.

The last scene of this act is the logical continuation of the last scene of the last act. It is introduced by a short scene in which Vasantasenā instructs her maid who has informed her of Maitreya's arrival, to bring him in along with *bandhula*. Vasantasenā is seated in her orchard which is separated from the main gate by no less then eight courts or halls filled with all sorts of riches. Maitreya while going through these is made to describe them and their contents in a gaudy style befitting the grandeur thereof. This description not only gives us a vivid idea of the vast wealth of Vasantasenā but at the same time saves the whole scene from being a mere pantomime. One wonders, however, whether all these courts with their contents can actually be shown on the stage: and even if they can, one can't help feeling that such lengthy descriptions greatly mar the verisimilitude of the scene and as such become tedious and reflect on the dramatic art of the author. The short lull here, however, easily gets merged into the excitement caused by the last scene with its reference to the sub-plot and the humorous and quaint remarks of Maitreya about the *bandhulas*,[40] and Vasantasenā's brother[41] and mother.[42] Dramatically, however, the scene has its own importance. For here we see the jewel necklace passing into the hands of Vasantasenā along with the message of Cārudatta. The message revealing the noble character of Cārudatta enhances Vasantasenā's love for him and makes her ready to pay a visit to him to turn his trick on him by returning the jewel necklace with a message similar to his own. Towards the close of the act we also get an inkling of the subject matter of the next act when Vasantasenā emphatically asserts that she with her heart overpowered with love-longing, will pay a visit to Cārudatta, despite the impediments of the gathering storm, growing dark, and showering rains.[43]

ACT V

Act V marks the climax of the first part of the play which evidently aims at tracing the development of Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta. It is with the purpose of heightening the intensity of her love for Cārudatta that the episodes of Saṁvāhaka and Śarvilaka have been introduced. The same purpose is served again by the *ratnāvalī* and also the *prāvāraka*. The same again is the effect of the rain-storm in the present act.; for it is on listening to the glowing description of it by Cārudatta[44] and the actual sight thereof that Vasantasenā's love-longing reaches the highest pitch, so much so that she at once casts her arms round his neck. The psychological development of love, which forms the main topic of all these acts, is responsible for the comparative lack of action, particularly in Acts II to V. But we can't agree with Dr. Ryder when he writes that 'during these episodic acts we almost forget that the main plot concerns the love of Vasantasenā and Cārudatta.' In fact every now and then we are made acquainted with growing intensity of Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta which is accelerated by these various episodes at every detail. The fact that this psychological development of love forms the subject-matter, makes this part of the play more poetical than dramatic, though it can't be denied that Śūdraka has shown exquisite skill in investing all this portion with keen dramatic interest.

With these preliminary remarks let us now turn to this act which may be said to contain five main scenes. The opening scene is nothing but a poetical description of the *durdina*, which is already referred to in the last act, given by Cārudatta who does not fail to read his dejection[45] therein to some extent. This scene introduces the

next scene by making Cārudatta express his concern at the delay caused by Maitreya in returning from Vasantasenā's house.

The next scene shows Maitreya on his way home to Cārudatta, and then conversing with him about the *ratnāvalī* where again we mark the difference between their lines of thought, and at the same time the sympathy[46] which Maitreya has for Cārudatta. The scene then ends with Maitreya telling Cārudatta that Vasantasenā is paying him a visit that evening and adding his own view of the matter that she must be coming to get something more from him[47] and Cārudatta only remarking that she would go away satisfied.[48]

The third scene is an agreeable variation, Kumbhīlaka and Maitreya, in the manner of the class of society they represent, indulging in humorous questions and answers and puns, and the former ultimately conveying the news that Vasantasenā is coming up. The news is at once conveyed to Cārudatta who is already there. It may be noted that during all this interval Cārudatta is present on the stage and yet it is but impossible that he should take part in the type of conversation Kumbhīlaka and Maitreya are having. But it would be absurd if he has to remain quite dumb all along. Śūdraka has very well tided over this difficulty by taking advantage of Maitreya's (i. e. *vidūṣaka's*) block-headedness and making him refer to Cārudatta for answers to the questions put to him by Kumbhīlaka. The scene then ends with Kumbhīlaka going away after receiving a mantle from Cārudatta for bringing a good news and Maitreya repeating his view about Vasantasenā's coming and Cārudatta expressing the same view as before.[49] We may note here that this exchange of views about Vasantasenā's coming between

Maitreya and Cārudatta occurs twice and is intended to show how love is working in the mind of Cārudatta also.

The next scene again is nothing but a description of the storm. This time it has the form of a dialogue (for two persons viṭa and Vasantasenā are addressing one another) and has a different colour altogether from the one in the opening scene. This long description like the description of Vasantasenā's house in the last act, must be considered a blemish on the author's workmanship as a dramatist, though on the whole it may be good poetry. Again it must be noted that it is more conventional than actual or plausible,[50] and this makes it all the worse in a drama. Cārudatta listening to the voice of *viṭa* asks Maitreya to see who is there ; and when he welcomes Vasantasenā, she politely asks *viṭa* to go and asks Maitreya where Cārudatta is. He tells her that he is in the *śuṣka-vṛkṣa-vāṭikā* and explains to her the significance of the name. This shifts the scene now to that *vāṭikā* where Vasantasenā's love finds its consummation. This scene together with the preliminary conversation between Vasantasenā and her maid is not only natural but at the same time avoids the awkwardness of the dramatis personæ remaining quite dumb on the stage till they reach the place of action viz. the *śuṣka-vṛkṣa-vāṭikā*.

The earlier part of the last scene creates a subtle humour when we see Vasantasenā playing his own trick on Cārudatta by handing over to him the *ratnāvalī* with a message similar to his own. We feel happy when Cārudatta knows the fact of the matter and as usual tries to give away a ring from his finger to the maid for her good news. His magnanimity here is again noticed by Vasantasenā who remarks that she loves him for this alone, though Cārudatta lapses here into his lamentations

on poverty.[51] Śūdraka has here shown his skill in making Maitreya ask for his bath-towel and thus creating humour and paving a way out of the serious situation. Vasantasenā's remark that Cārudatta should not have treated her so lightly by sending her the necklace only evokes a bitter reference to the disabilities of poverty,[52] and again Maitreya's humorous question here saves the situation from becoming very serious. Now Maitreya draws attention of Cārudatta to the renewing showers of rain. Cārudatta describes the phenomenon passionately representing *vidyut* as an *abhisārikā* embracing her lover *ambara*,[53] which excites Vasantasenā's passionate love to its climax and she at once throws her arms round his neck. Maitreya, however, misreads the situation and tries to blame the *Durdina* for frightening Vasantasenā.[54] But Cārudatta explains the matter to him[55] and after expressing his joy and describing the rainy day, they all go into the house.

ACT VI

The sixth act begins with a scene that has given its name to the play. It opens in the house of Cārudatta on the morning following the stormy night of the last act. From the earlier part of the scene we know that Vasantasenā has now entered the inner chamber of Cārudatta's house and also secured a place in the heart of all the inmates thereof so much so that they would be very sorry when she would go away from the house as much as she herself. The next portion brings out vividly the magnanimity of Dhūtā and also her deep love for Cārudatta when she returns the necklace sent to her as present by Vasantasenā with the remark that her husband was her best ornament.[56]

The following section represents Rohasena crying for a golden toy-cart and Radanikā in her attempt to

appease him going towards Vasantasenā who is glad to know that he is Cārudatta's son, and asks why he is weeping. The boy asks Radanikā who Vasantasenā was and refuses to believe her when she tells him that she is his mother; for was she not laden with gold?[57] At this Vasantasenā at once takes off her ornaments and putting them all in his clay-cart asks him to get a golden cart made out of them and assures him that now she has become his mother.[58] Very simple as this section looks, it has a far-reaching importance of its own. The last act has led Vasantasenā's love to its consummation; and now nothing is more natural than that Vasantasenā, true to her love, should do anything to deserve the title of Rohasena's mother. This act on her part shows her nobility and the purity of her love for Cārudatta; and we naturally expect (with Vasantasenā) that this act of hers should lead to her greater happiness. Little do we dream at this stage that any thing wrong would come out of this small incident. But this very incident—nay this act of Vasantasenā—it is that is ultimately going to prove the last straw which dooms Cārudatta to capital punishment. Vasantasenā, however, is actuated here by Rohasena's weeping because he has only a clay-cart and not a gold one like his neighbour. It may thus be seen that the clay-cart is the root of all the future trouble and hence deserves all the importance attached to it by the author by naming his play after it.

Then follows a series of short scenes, the action in which takes place inside the house of Cārudatta, or on the street adjoining it. The juxta-position of such scenes alternately cannot but presuppose the existence of complex stage arrangements as already noted above. The incidents have been very well arranged by Śūdraka

so as to lead naturally to an interchange of carts. That Vardhamānaka should go away with his cart (instead of on foot) to bring the cushions he has forgotten while Vasantasenā is having her toilet, is but natural particularly in view of the fact that his bulls are restive.[59] That Sthāvaraka, the *ceṭa* of Śakāra, should park his cart rather away from the hubbub is also quite natural, though it is only an accident that the house, at which he parks it, should belong to Cārudatta. But this does not strike us as unnatural and hence does not mar the verisimilitude of the scene. Equally natural is it again that Vasantasenā after her toilet should in her haste get into the cart before the house without even dreaming that it might be some other cart; and also that Sthāvaraka should not notice her, since the cart is closed or veiled. He does feel the cart rather heavy; but that is again naturally explained by his fatigue incurred by giving a turn to the wheel of a fellow driver there.[60] With the same skill has Śūdraka managed the other part of this affair. The fetter on Aryaka's foot makes a jingling sound as he goes to the car and Vardhamānaka naturally thinks that Vasantasenā is coming up. Naturally enough does he request her to get into the cart from behind only, since his bulls are rather restive.[61] And as the jingling stops and the cart feels heavier, he naturally thinks that Vasantasenā has got into the cart[62] and starts it. All this is so perfectly natural that one is simply struck at the skill of Śūdraka in investing such simple matters as restiveness of the bulls, fetters on Aryaka's foot, and *cakra-parivṛtti* with such dramatic significance.

Between Vasantasenā's departure in Sthāvaraka's cart and Vardhamānaka's arrival with his car, Śūdraka has given us a short scene introducing to us Āryaka, the cow-

boy who according to *siddhādeśa* is destined to be a king. From Śarvilaka's remark in the last act we are ready to see him set free from the terrible dungeon where he was kept a captive. We also sympathise with him in his sad plight to which he is reduced for no fault of his and we also wish to see him escape in safety. We are, therefore, glad that he happens to get into Cārudatta's cart. But it may be observed here that Śūdraka has here made use of the element of chance in making Sthāvaraka see somebody slinking away before him and yet check his curiosity,[63] in making Āryaka come to the house of Cārudatta[64] only and not of any one else and lastly in making Vardhamānaka return just in time for Aryaka not to be required to wait. Chance, it must be remembered, if often resorted to would certainly disturb the verisimilitude of the play and hence be pronounced a blemish in the author's workmanship. In the present case, however, the element of chance (not very much against our experience in everyday life) is further justified on the ground of the *siddhādeśa* already referred to. This accidental use of Cārudatta's cart by Āryaka has its own significance again as revealing the magnanimity of the former as we shall see it later on, and is not, as such, felt to be objectionable.

The last scene of this act presents to us Vīraka and Candanaka—two police officers—holding up Cārudatta's cart and discussing whether it should be allowed to pass uninspected. Vīraka insisting on inspection, asked Candanaka to do it assuring him that he has full faith in him. But unfortunately Candanaka's slip of tongue rouses Vīraka's suspicion[65] and he now insists on inspecting it himself again. This Candanaka does not want; for he wants to save Āryaka[66] and keep his promise given

just a minute before. He, therefore, picks up a quarrel; and Vīraka tries to get into the cart, he even drags him by the hair and kicks him. Vīraka, therefore, goes away saying that he would lodge a complaint in the court; while Candanaka gives Āryaka a sword and later on goes away declaring that he would now join Āryaka with all his relatives. This scene is important for more reasons than one. It gives us a faithful picture of the police officers; it also gives us some idea of the southerners and their way of picking quarrels; and lastly it also contains the seed of further development of the plot as we shall see how in act IX Vīraka's going to the court has been utilised by Śūdraka in turning the case against Cārudatta.

Act VI thus we see has action moving at a very high speed and contains seeds of the impending calamity viz. (i) Vasantasenā's giving her ornaments to Rohasena; (ii) Vasantasenā actually getting into Śakāra's cart; (iii) Vardhamānaka stating to the police officers that he was taking Vasantasenā in Cārudatta's cart to the *Puṣpakaraṇḍaka* garden to sport with Cārudatta; and (iv) lastly Candanaka quarrelling with Vīraka and actually kicking him. The danger of the second incident alone we can realise at the moment; the last two seem to be quite immaterial to us and perhaps we are even glad that Āryaka is saved thereby. The first is expected to result in some thing happy; while the third is totally immaterial. But as we see later on all these incidents have ultimately resulted in something against Cārudatta and brought him in life's peril. Āryaka getting into Cārudatta's cart (of course, by coincidence) also is fraught with immense dramatic interest as we shall presently see.

ACT VII

Act VII is the shortest act containing but one incident of Āryaka and Cārudatta seeing one another and the latter helping the former even at his own risk by requesting him to use his cart further. This act presents a good contrast to the previous one which is full of rapid action and also to the next one in which Vasantasenā getting into a wrong cart has led to her strangling by the luscious and abominable wretch, Śakāra, whereas here Āryaka, a perfect stranger, is saved by the noble Cārudatta even at his own risk. We also notice here the magnanimity of Cārudatta who not only readily saves Āryaka but even presses him to use his own cart even further and thus save himself. Cārudatta is quite aware of the risk[67] he is running and yet he simply can't help being of some help to others. Nor is this less important. For it is Cārudatta's desire (i. e. his promise) to save Āryaka that has led to his otherwise inexplicable reticence in the court; and the consequent decision and death sentence on him. Nor can this matter be dubbed down as insipid. This is the reason why Śūdraka did not think it fit to relegate it to a *praveśaka*. But if it is to be acted on the stage, none would even dream of including it in the next act (strangling of Vasantasenā) from which it differs so much both in spirit as well as in sentiment. Similarly it is impossible to include it in the last owing to the difference of the scene of action; for whereas the scene of action here is the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden that in the last act is the street adjoining the house of Cārudatta. It may thus be seen that action taking place in act VII has to be kept out of both the preceding as well as the succeeding acts by considerations of the unity of place and the unity of action respectively; and the matter far

from being insipid (or *nīrasa*) cannot be said to be *saṁsūcya*[68] to form the subject of an interlude. It is, therefore, not quite true to say that Śūdraka is constrained by the requirements of a *prakaraṇa* to raise the act under consideration to the dignity of an act. For it was with the poet to call his play a *prakarana* or by any other name he liked and also because according to Bharata, a *prakaraṇa*[69] may have not necessarily ten acts, but any number not less than five and not more than ten. It is, therefore, owing to its intrinsic interest and importance alone that Śūdraka thought it fit to give the incident of *Aryakāpaharaṇa* in a separate act by itself, notwithstanding the fact that it would be short beyond expectation.

ACT VIII

Act VIII, taking place in the same place as the last act presents a good contrast to its serene atmosphere by the quaint but disgustful humour of Śakāra whose cruelty, conceit, and utter disregard for others for satisfying his own whim are very clearly brought out. Though at times he appears to be a fool, he is really a combination of a fool and a knave. We really appreciate it when viṭa describes his tribe as '*fleshy tress with topsy-turvy mentality*'.[70] Another point to be noted in this scene is the appearance of a monk there. From Viṭa's remark and description of the monk we feel that he must be the Saṁvāhaka of the second act, who has turned a monk. He has come to the garden to wash his garment. This naturally explains his appearance at the close of the act again to get the garment dried up. Fortunately for Vasantasenā the factor responsible for her rescue is present even before the actual calamity is in sight—a sheer stroke of luck.

A short scene now brings Sthāvaraka with Śakāra's cart (Vasantasenā therein) at the scene of action; and again we have a continuation of the first scene. Here we see Śakāra's utter disregard for others just for satisfying his whim, as also his vanity when he compels his *ceṭa* to take the cart over the broken wall and also when he rebukes his *viṭa* for getting into the cart first, though at his own pressure.[71] His timidity makes him jump out of the cart at the sight of Vasantasenā (who was there in the cart) whom he mistakes for a thief or a demoness.[72] He has also displayed his cunning by deceiving *viṭa* (as he took it) by telling him that there was a woman in the cart and that he should see who it is.[73] Dramatically this has its own significance for it gives Vasantasenā an opportunity to explain herself and seek Viṭa's help.[74] This further shows us how Viṭa's readiness to help her is baffled by Śakāra's caprice.[75] Viṭa with some plan in his mind then reveals to Śakāra that Vasantasenā has come to sport with him. This naturally excites Śakāra who in an attempt to propitiate her falls at her feet and is kicked by her.[76] This act on the part of Vasantasenā may not be practical and yet we must agree that it is quite natural if we take into consideration the mood in which she is then with all her dreams of meeting and sporting with Cārudatta baffled and the sight of the unwanted and even detested man having come to her lot.[77] This rash act has its own effect. Śakāra tries to persuade viṭa to murder her; and tries also his *ceṭa* for the purpose in a manner that creates some humour.[78] But finding them both unwilling he ultimately sends them away and undertakes the task himself. Śakāra here has even outwitted his viṭa by giving a proper excuse for sending him away,[79] by accepting Vasantasenā as a *nyāsa*,[80] and by making a show[81a]

of propitiating Vasantasenā as soon as viṭa is away (just to convince him of his sincerity if at all he has shrewdly tried to watch him by hiding himself). Vasantasenā again when left alone with Śakāra could have saved herself by being a bit practical. But in her present mood and also by her very nature she could not do so; and adds fuel to the fire by her remarks[81] one after another in praise of Cārudatta and the consequent slander of Śakāra, that Cārudatta is ever present in her heart, that Cārudatta would save her if he happens to be there, and finally addressing a bow to him. She is murdered (or rather strangled) and Śakāra presents a highly disgusting figure when he boasts of his valour in having committed that act.[82]

Here again a short scene shows viṭa as bringing back the ceṭa with him and going to Śakāra. On their way they see a tree fall down and crush a woman under it. This is an ill omen and viṭa feels anxious for Vasantasenā's safety[83] and later on again this crushed body of a woman is used to turn the case against Cārudatta[84] and sentence him to death. Now again we have a continuation of the old scene which exposes the still darker side of Śakāra who tries to share his crime with viṭa,[85] and then even tries to pass it on to him.[86] Being baffled however in this he allows him to go; and hits on a different plan altogether.[87] He asks his ceṭa to go and wait for him in the terrace of his house. Then he covers the body of Vasantasenā with a heap of dry fallen leaves; decides to shift the crime on Cārudatta by lodging a complaint in the court against him, and to suppress all evidence by keeping ceṭa fettered on his terrace. Planning thus to ruin Cārudatta he is about to leave the place when he espies the monk and being afraid of being noticed by him, jumps

over the wall and goes away. Here again we see how the appearance of the monk on the stage is hinted at.

The concluding section is again only a continuation of the main scene. Here we are shown how Vasantasenā comes back to life, how she is recognised by the monk (i. e. Saṁvāhaka) and how he helps her. Here we mark the beginning of the end of the whole plot. Act VIII on the whole has a great interest for us because it has shown us the strangling of Vasantasenā by Śakāra, Śakāra's plan to father his crime on Cārudatta, and Vasantasenā's revival and rescue by Saṁvāhaka. The first is watched by us with bated breath, the second creates a great suspense and anxiety, while the third we hope would dispel any misfortune that might befall Cārudatta on account of Śakāra's plan. Here again we begin to realise for the first time the significance of the threat '*āmaraṇātam vairam bhaviṣyati*' sent by Śakāra to Cārudatta; and we have to see, to our horror, how very true the words come in the next act, and our suspense is intensified only to be relieved by the appearance of Vasantasenā in the act next to it.

ACT IX

From Act VI onwards each act has its own suspense for the spectator. In act VI the suspense created by the exchange of the carts, and heightened to a pitch when the cart of Cārudatta is held up, finds some relief when Candanaka allows the cart to go. Act VII creates suspense by Cārudatta helping Āryaka by lending him the use of his cart and it is not till the end of the play that we get a relief in this matter. The next act takes the suspense to the utmost pitch by making the spectator witness the strangling of Vasantasenā on the stage and the bastard Śakāra planning to father his crime on

Cārudatta. But here again we are afforded some relief by the timely help rendered by Saṁvāhaka in reviving her. Act IX shows the plan of Śakāra working in full swing and our suspense again is on the increase towards the climax bit by bit. The scene is laid throughout this act in the court and its ground ; the act can be described as one long scene intercepted at intervals by some short scenes meant to introduce the required *dramatis personae* on the stage.

The opening scene shows us the place of action (the court) all properly arranged by Śodhanaka. Then comes Śakāra repeating his plan to father his crime on Cārudatta. Next comes the judge along with *śreṣṭhī* and *kāyastha* dwelling at some length on the great responsibility that a judge has to shoulder ; and the handicaps and difficulties he has to face.[88] It is a fine dramatic irony to see the judge declare that, for a judge it is easy to incur censure than applause[89] little dreaming that he will actually have to experience the truth of this remark in a short while.

Before, however, the trial actually begins we are shown how the judge and all present there are averse to Śakāra[90] and have admiration (and hence also partiality) for Cārudatta,[91] and how a threat from Śakāra has its effect even on the judge.[92] This circumstance has to be well borne in mind while considering whether any injustice is done to Cārudatta in this trial. Śūdraka has taken care to place before us the fact that if at all partiality was possible it would have been in favour of Cārudatta rather than otherwise.

In the preliminary questioning Śakāra states that as he had been to his garden in the city, he saw a woman

lying dead there and from her vacant limbs he thinks that she must have been strangled for her ornaments. He then gives the name of the woman, Vasantasenā. Then the judge has Vasantasenā's mother summoned and from her deposition it is known that her daughter has gone to Cārudatta, who is then summoned up.

Here a short scene shows Cārudatta wondering whether help rendered by him to Āryaka has become known to the king.[93] It should be noted that by making Cārudatta express his concern this way, Śūdraka is perhaps explaining the reticence of Cārudatta at the trial. Cārudatta has various ill omens[94] which only evoke a remark from him that deties will at last set everything all right, quite in keeping with his character as we have seen it all along. Similarly Cārudatta's description of the court[95] is just what it might appear to any religious-minded person of simplicity. All this scene only serves to add to the serenity of the atmosphere. With the entrance of Cārudatta at the court the old scene continues, and we see the judge's great regard for him as contrasted with the attitude that Śakāra shows towards him.

In reply to the judge's question Cārudatta, after some hesitation confesses having connection with a *gaṇikā* adding that it should not reflect on his *cāritra.*[96] But when he is asked where she is, he merely tells that she has gone home and cannot give any further details as to how she went.[97] But the main reason for this is to be found in his *svagata* remark.[98] When Śakāra openly accuses Cārudatta of Vasantasenā's murder even the judge[99] thinks that it is impossible and is accused of partiality by Śakāra. Even Vasantasenā's mother remembers the *ratnāvalī* incident and declares that it is impossible that Cārudatta would commit such a crime for

gold.[100] Ultimately Cārudatta in reply to the judge's question declares that Vasantasenā went home during his absence and that he cannot say whether she went home on foot or in a cart.[101] At this stage there seems to be a dead-lock. All present there are in Carudatta's favour and not inclined to believe in Śakāra's story which for want of any evidence is, therefore, about to fall.

Unfortunately for Cārudatta, just at this stage Vīraka enters the court with his complaint against Candanaka, and in reply to the judge's question tells that the driver of the cart in question stated that it was Cārudatta's cart and that he was taking Vasantasenā in it to the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden to sport with Cārudatta.[102] This proves the fulcrum on which the whole case now begins to turn the other way. For now it is proved on independent evidence that Vasantasenā had gone to Cārudatta in the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden in his own cart, which indirectly gives a lie to Cārudatta's statement that she went home in his absence. The judge still has a soft corner for him and (perhaps with a view to absolve him) asks Vīraka to go and see if any female corpse is to be seen in the garden there. When Vīraka returns saying *Yes* to the query, he is asked on what grounds he says so; and when he gives reasonable grounds,[103] the judge loses all hope of absolving Cārudatta,[104] is inclined to believe in Śakāra's story, and requests Cārudatta to tell the truth.[105] Śakāra now emboldened by prospect of success protests strongly against Cārudatta occupying a seat in the court and insists that he should be asked to vacate it.[106] The judge has to agree; and Cārudatta leaves his seat requesting the judge at the same time to weigh the matter well.[107] But beyond this he has nothing to say; and when Śakāra asks him to confess, he denounces him and expresses his

concern why Maitreya, whom he has sent to Vasantasenā to return her ornaments, has not yet returned.[108] Here we now see how Cārudatta is hoping to be absolved by the appearance of Maitreya who, he hopes, would give all the details of Vasantasenā and thus help to refute the charge against him. This also serves as a hint for Maitreya's appearance on the stage. And he is introduced in the court by a short scene in which he is presented as getting the news of Cārudatta being summoned to the court and hence going direct to the court instead of Vasantasenā's house.[109] In the court he comes to know of the charge against Cārudatta. This rouses him to indignation and in scuffle with Śakāra, the root-cause of the whole trouble, the *suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa* drops down from under his arm-pit. This naturally proves the last straw. Till now there was no evidence to show that Cārudatta strangled Vasantasenā for her ornaments, though on circumstantial evidence it was clear that she had gone to the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden to sport with him, that nobody knows that she has returned from there, and that a woman's corpse is actually found in the garden, which apparently supports the story of Vasantasenā's murder. But there is nothing so far to connect this matter with Cārudatta beyond all doubt. This missing link is supplied by the *suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa* ; for it is that very *bhāṇḍa* for which the murder of Vasantasenā has been committed as Śakāra has already stated. Hence it is that at this stage all present there hang their heads down[110] and even Cārudatta is now sure that the case will go against him.[111] The judge feels much for Cārudatta;[112] and *sreṣṭhi* and kāyastha ask Vasantasenā's mother to recognise the ornaments. The old woman tries to save Cārudatta in her own way,[113] but Cārudatta himself declares

that they belong to Vasantasenā[114] and at the same time avoids telling how they came to be separated from her. He only stated that they came from his house.[115] Evidently he did not want to expose his poverty by giving out the real circumstances in which Vasantasenā left the ornaments in his house, particularly because none would believe it at all.[116] He, therefore, merely says that he cannot say anything more than that they came from his house. Now the judge is rather harsh in obedience to his duty and on pain of whipping asks him to give out the truth;[117] and Cārudatta also, thinking that he can't live without Vasantasenā, gives the confession leaving only one word viz. *vyāpāditā* for Śakāra to declare.[118] With this confession the trial is over; Cārudatta is handed over to the officer and Vasantasenā's mother making her last attempt to save Cārudatta, is asked to go away.[119] Śakāra also goes away satisfied.[120]

The judge is throughout considerate and kind to Cārudatta. He sends his findings to the king with a recommendation (on the authority of Manu) that Cārudatta should be only expelled with all his belongings.[121] The king, however, does not accept the recommendation and sentences Cārudatta to be impaled like an ordinary culprit. Cārudatta hearing this only remarks that Pālaka is acting thoughtlessly here.[122] But he does not say anything further except requesting Maitreya to bring Rohasena to him. But Maitreya is asked to go away from the place and Cārudatta is taken away while he is declaring that the king should punish him only after trying him with the ordeals and that if he is impaled without such a trial, he would be courting abysmal ruin and hell for himself.[123]

We have seen how all along the judge has been uniformly kind and considerate to Cārudatta and in the beginning has been even partial. To all appearances Cārudatta seems to have had a fair trial and we actually see how the case is going from bad to worse at every step so that even the sympathetic (and to some extent partial) judge finds it difficult to save him any longer. The more he has tried to save him[124] the more did Cārudatta get entangled by the facts as they came to light one after another. In fact none present there feels that any injustice is done to Cārudatta, though every one has full sympathies for him. Under these circumstances it is difficult to say that the judge did not rightly conduct or decide the trial. Naturally then arises the question as to the vituperations[125] of Cārudatta against king Pālaka. And it is sometimes felt that his character has suffered thereby.[126] But it must be remembered that though apparently the evidence seems to prove the guilt of Cārudatta and though to all appearances he also has confessed to it, there are certain matters which should have been paid due attention. The confession of Cārudatta, it must be observed, is no confession at all in the real sense of the term; for Cārudatta never completes the sentence of the confession, the most important word therein being left for Śakāra to speak out.[127] And even this so-called confession has come from his lips only under threat of being whipped.[128] Secondly it should be noted that towards the fag end of the trial when all the authorities in the court are taking the ornaments as belonging to him, is it not Cārudatta himself who of his own accord declares that they are not his but Vasantasenā's ?[129] Not that he is not aware of the consequences of such a statement. But he has shown by his action

here that he cares more for truth (and *cāritra*) than anything else. This should have set the judge thinking about Cārudatta's other statements also to find another solution to the forthcoming evidence. The same holds good in the case of Cārudatta's declaration that he does not know how the ornaments got separated from Vasantasenā's person; but knows that they have come from his house.[130] Does this again not show that Cārudatta is giving out the truth that the ornaments have come from his house? And if he is not giving any further details, what reason is there to suppose that he must have got them only by strangling their owner? In fact the truthfulness displayed by him even under critical circumstances should have set the judge thinking before he decided the case against Cārudatta. This in other words means that if circumstantial evidence seemed to prove the case against Cārudatta, his truthfulness all along and his declaration that he does not know anything further about Vasantasenā and her ornaments should have made the judge think that there was something which Cārudatta did not think it fit to disclose. Apparently the judge felt like that and hence he asked Cārudatta to tell the truth but on pain of whipping, which is nothing but compulsion. He should have rather asked him to make a statement on the whole matter. In fact Cārudatta has several times denied the charge against him: but his denial went unheeded.[131] This statement denying the accusation against him would have militated against the circumstantial evidence and created a doubt. This naturally would have called for the use of the ordeals.[132] It is this trial by ordeal that Cārudatta expects to have. But neither the judge nor the king take such a view of the matter with the result that Cārudatta is sentenced to death. Hence it is again that Cārudatta has exhorted

the judge to think and weigh the matter and also has accused the king of acting thoughtlessly. The whole case was sent to the king and yet he did not think about the case himself. He only blindly adopted the decision of the judge. Had Cārudatta been accused of high treason and sentenced for it he would not have minded it. For that was what he actually expected and feared.[133] But strangely enough he has been accused of and sentenced for something which on the face of it is quite absurd.[134] This should explain Cārudatta's charges against king Pālaka and particularly his argument that he should be tried by ordeal before he is impaled. Thus now we may say that though the trial was conducted on fair and just lines, yet no consideration was given to the intrinsic merit of Cārudatta and the noblest truthfulness and integrity displayed by him at the court in view of which he justly expected a trial by ordeal; and hence Cārudatta is but right when he declares Pālaka to be only thoughtless in his decision and declares that if he (i. e. Cārudatta) is impaled without a trial by ordeal, then the king would be only ruining himself and throwing himself into hell. Nor should this be taken as an imprecation against the king; in view of Cārudatta's character in general as we have observed it all through, it should rather be taken as a mere statement of facts as based on the authority of धर्मशास्त्र.

ACT X

By the end of Act IX the spectator is all despair but for the slight ray of hope cast by the revival of Vasantasenā in the end of act VIII and the rescue of Āryaka in the act previous to it. But both these are only doubtful aids, for nothing has happened as yet to show which way these incidents are developing. It is in this mood of

despair, dejection and suspense that the spectator finds act X commencing with Cārudatta, dressed and decorated like a *vadhya*, being led by *caṇḍālas* in procession through the streets of Ujjayinī. The whole atmosphere is pathetic. All—the whole city of Ujjayinī—are merged in sorrow, tears from their eyes creating the phenomenon of rains and rainbow without clouds.[135] The pathos of the whole scene is rising up at every step and the spectators' sympathy for Cārudatta is deepened by several circumstances viz. that such a pious man should have to face such an end,[136] that he should be required to seek a favour from the *caṇḍālas*,[137] that he should have nothing but a *yajñopavīta* to bestow on his son,[138] that he should have not only to listen to, but even to give out with his own lips, the obnoxious contents of the proclamation.[139] Nor is the scene wanting in indications of the noble trait of Cārudatta which heighten our regard for him and at once make us recognise him as the hero. His description of the *yajñopavīta*,[140] his appreciation of Sthāvaraka even in his saddest hour,[141] his mild words about Śakāra who is the root of all his present calamity,[142] his explanation of his dejection[143] and lastly his firm faith in his *dharma*[144]—all these circumstances heighten our regard for him. It must be noted that in the absence of these circumstances we would have merely sympathised with Cārudatta and that would to some extent have detracted from his title to the position of the hero in the real sense of the term. Cārudatta's claim to that title, as we shall see in the next chapter, lies not in any active part played by him, but in the extra-ordinary qualities displayed by him under the most trying circumstances. And Śūdraka has shown his great dramatic sense by emphasizing these qualities side by side with the pathetic happening in Act X.

Another point to be noted about this act is the skill with which Śūdraka has kept up the element of suspense. He has so arranged the different details that there is a constant rise and fall in the suspense felt by the spectator. The suspense is on the increase in this act and reaches top height when Cārudatta embraces his son and when the latter and also Maitreya request the caṇḍālas to impale them for Cārudatta, which, of course, Cārudatta does not allow.[145] Here we get some relief by the appearance of Śakāra's ceṭa on the stage and things seem for a moment to take a brighter turn.[146] But this relief is only short-lived and Śakāra's trick succeeds in turning the tide once more against Cārudatta,[147] and his suggestion that caṇḍālas should kill Cārudatta together with his son only seems to heighten the suspense.[148] The caṇḍāla's reply[149] to Śakāra, however, lessens its intensity to some extent; and the mention of the several circumstances[150] occasioning a culprit's release makes us fondly hope for any one of them to occur at the moment. We also feel with Cārudatta that Vasantasenā should herself relieve him and us also.[151] But the appearance of the terrible cemetery[152] gives a lie to all our hopes and again the suspense is highly intensified. Here we get a relief by the appearance of the monk and Vasantasenā on the stage and yet our suspense is now all the more intense than ever before; for we are not sure whether they would reach the place in time just to save Cārudatta. The sudden dropping of the sword from the Caṇḍāla's hand affords some relief again and we hope with the caṇḍālas for Cārudatta's relief through divine succour.[153] And what a relief it is to find the monk and Vasantasenā arrive at the place in good time to save Cārudatta. But caṇḍāla's going away to report the matter

to king Pālaka coupled with Śakāra's running away from the place at the sight of Vasantasenā again rouses a bit of anxiety in our minds ; for we are not sure what these fellows would do. But we are relieved when the caṇḍāla comes and declares the king's order that Vasantasenā's murderer should be impaled. Now the suspense seems to be all over ; and there is joy everywhere. The revolution is successful ; Āryaka is on the throne and he has, through his representative Śarvilaka, bestowed the territory of Kuśāvatī on Cārudatta as a token of his friendship and gratitude.[154] Śakāra is brought a captive and Cārudatta to the amazement of all present desires him to be set free and thus made *upakāra-hata.*[155] This is just like Cārudatta, the hero !

At this point again a suspense is caused by the news that Dhūtā is bent on burning herself to death and would not listen to anybody. This suspense is heightened by Cārudatta swooning by the news. But soon everything is all right and there is joy again everywhere.

Here it may be observed that this scene about Dhūtā appears like an intruder. Śarvilaka as Āryaka's representative is bestowing coronation honours on the various dramatis personae ; and the scene of Dhūtā seems to have come like a wedge breaking the main scene into two parts. We are actually told by a commentator that the portion has been composed by one Nīlakaṇṭha to supply the want felt by him in the play as it originally was.[156] Though we might admire the skill of Nīlakaṇṭha in investing the scene with keen interest, yet we may not agree with him that it is absolutely necessary to bring all the characters on the stage at the close of the play. That this section bringing about a meeting between Cārudatta on the one hand and his wife and son on the other was

absent in the original is also shown by the fact that Cārudatta in his recounting of happy events makes no mention of it at all.[157]

Śarvilaka as representative of king Āryaka bestows the position of a *vadhū* on Vasantasenā,[158] and in deference to Cārudatta's desire Candanaka, and Saṁvāhaka are amply rewarded; and even Śakāra has his position retained. Cārudatta then recounts all the happy events[159] he has by now experienced, describes how destiny plays with human beings, and in reply to Śarvilaka's question, recites the *Bharata-vākya*[160] expressing his desire for happiness and piety for all everywhere.

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERS

In the whole field of Sanskrit dramatic literature the Mṛcchakaṭika stands unparallelled in presenting before us a large number of characters drawn from different strata of society high and low. Though it has a political sub-plot, the *Mṛcchakaṭika* can hardly be said to have political characters in the real sense of the term. The political aspect is thoroughly subdued to the main plot which is mainly social. Śūdraka has drawn his characters from all classes and walks of society and endowed them with individualities. Sometimes he has introduced his characters in pairs and thus depicted them more effectively by the use of contrast. Such, for example, are the viṭas, the ceṭas, the ceṭās, the gamblers, the police officers, and the caṇḍālas. But the main point to be noticed in Śūdraka's art of character delineation is that he has made Cārudatta the centre; and evolved and depicted all other characters by bringing them in connection with him and at the same time brought out Cārudatta's character to the full in his dealings with them.

Cārudatta admittedly is the hero of the *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, though there is some feeble voice raised against him in this respect in some quarters. (A hereditary *sārthavāha*, son of Sāgaradatta and grandson of Vinayadatta,[1] he is reduced to poverty owing to his extreme benevolence or munificence.[2] He is a well-bred Hindu down to the marrow with a belief in omens,[3] good and bad, an unflinching faith[4] in deities and religious observances and ritual, endowed with modesty[5] and a keen sense of morality[6] and a keener sense of self-respect.[7] Apprecia-

tive by nature,[8] he is also compassionate[9] to those who resort to him even at his cost or personal risk. He is always considerate[10] to others including his wife.[11] The most important trait in his chatacter—a trait that he takes pride in and guards so scrupulously[12]—is his *cāritra* or integrity,[13] which coupled with a magnanimous heart[14] is responsible for the various ups and downs in his life.

All these qualities of Cārudatta have been brought out by Śūdraka through his dealings with various characters around him so much so that these characters[15a] themselves praise him very highly for these qualities. They love and respect him even when he has fallen on worse days. Śakāra is the only exception.

To add to these, there is love of music[15] and poetical nature[16] which add to his dignity and grace. It is no wonder then that such a character should have won the heart of all and should have attracted the attention of the most beautiful girl of Ujjayinī and ultimately inspired her to offer him her love unsolicited.

Cārudatta, however, is indulging so much in his musings on poverty[17] and at all times seems so much to depend on or play into the hands of fate or destiny,[18] that some critics are unwilling to accept him as the hero of the Mṛcchakaṭika in the real sense of the term. Why should he be called a hero if he only keeps quiet and simply believes in deities and destiny and goes on lamenting over poverty every now and then? This view about Cārudatta, however, is not quite correct. It is true that he lapses time and again into lamentations on poverty, and that he does not act--act positively--and also that at every point he fares better or worse only by chance or sheer luck to all appearances. But this is only a superficial view of the matter. If we go through his lamenta-

tions it will be clear that he is sorry not for loss of wealth *per se*, but because loss of wealth has deprived him of all power or capacity to be of any help to others.[19] He is sorry, for example, because Śarvilaka, the thief, after so much trouble has had to go away from his house empty-handed ;[20] or because he cannot bestow anything on the *ceṭī* for bringing him a good news.[21] He has referred to the other disabilities[22] of the poor, no doubt. But the main point which he often repeats is just the absence of capacity to help others. As for his belief in deities and destiny, it must be observed that he is acting up to the principle 'Trust in God and do the right'. Do we not find him firmly expressing his faith that a *gṛhastha* must perform his *nitya vidhis* ?[23] Does he not assert himself against Maitreya saying that he will not resort to falsehood and lose his *cāritra* ?[24] Does he not help Āryaka even at his own risk ?[25] Does he not give away the *ratnāvalī* to Vasantasenā inspite of Maitreya's remonstrances ?[26] Does he not give out the truth and correct a wrong impression of the assessors even at a very critical moment ?[27] Does he not keep silent and refuse to make any statement with a view to save Āryaka ?[28] Does he not show his highest magnanimity—the height not reached by anybody, not even Vasantasenā[29]—by pardoning Śakāra and declaring that he should be allowed to retain his former position ?[30] The fact is that Cārudatta is a *dhīrapraśānta* type of hero ; and has displayed his heroness in the self-control, rectitude, and *tyāga* which, being all psychological factors, naturally lack the external pomp and paraphernalia of physical action. That he is a tool almost in the hands of destiny is no fault of his. For man, after all, is only nothing before destiny. In fact Śūdraka does essay to show the working of destiny in

this play.[31] What we have to see here is how he has reacted under various circumstances when he was in the clutches of destiny. If to act positively and bravely is heroism, to hold one's own inspite of destiny is not the less of it. And we see how Cārudatta has at every point asserted himself, his character or *cāritra*. Nor is it quite true to say that Cārudatta plays into the hands of destiny. For it is his magnanimity, munificence and integrity that have almost cost him his very life ; and it is these very qualities again that have won him Vasantasenā's love, Āryaka's friendship, a small kingdom of Kuśāvatī, and love and respect of all. Thus we see that he fares better or worse on account of these salient traits of his own character in which he persists inspite of odds and which he preserves even when fortune smiles on him. It is these circumstances that make him really worthy of the position of the hero in the real sense of the term.

Vasantasenā, a courtesan by birth, is yet a *Kulastrī* by her demeanour. Though smitten with love at first sight, she does not all of a sudden offer her love to Cārudatta. She is a modest and well-bred Hindu girl who would not throw her social disability by taking advantage of Cārudatta's wrongly given order to take Rohasena in.[32] She is attracted by Cārudatta's qualities so much so that any one, that is somehow connected with him, is for her an object of adoration[33] and any thing belonging to him, her proud possession.[34] She has become so much alive to a sense of love that she sympathises with her maid Madanikā engrossed in loving talk with Śarvilaka,[35] and at once sets Madanikā free and gives her away to him.[36] The depth of her love for Cārudatta, however, is clearly seen when she spurns and kicks Śakāra and to all appearances dies with his name on her lips.[37] All the other traits

in her character are brought out by Śūdraka in connection with her love for Cārudatta. Thus her love of painting,[38] her cleverness in conversation,[39] her shrewdness,[40] her considerateness for others,[41] even her servants, her hatred and dislike for Śakāra,[42] her boldness[43] as well as poetical nature,[44] her readiness to help others[45]—all these qualities of Vasantasenā are brought out before us one after another as connected with the love for Cārudatta deep-rooted in her heart. She is very beautiful and well accomplished in fine arts like painting and music, is of a pious temperament, though sometimes indolent,[46] and has won the confidence as well as affecion of all.[47] She is highly praised by all,[48] even Śakāra,[49] and was looked upon as the ornament of her town.[50] Though at times irritable,[51] she is calm by nature and possesses a sense of humour[52] also. Being, however, obsessed with Cārudatta's love she is beside herself almost and has lost all her shrewdness (natural to her profession), and has thus brought herself to life's peril. This, of course, is just what is expected of a girl so deeply engrossed in love. Did not Śakuntalā offend Durvāsas under similar circumstances? Vasantasenā's behaviour with Śakāra all through and particularly in Act VIII and her getting into the wrong cart in her hurry, mark her as a woman of our own flesh and blood, and cannot, therefore, be taken as a defect in Śūdraka's conception.[53] Deservedly she is the heroine of our play and takes a leading and active part in promoting the love towards her union with Cārudatta and ultimately brings it about by playing the *abhisārikā*. Fortunately she is saved and brougnt to the southern cemetery just in time to save Cārudatta and is amply rewarded with the title of *vadhū*[54], an honour so devoutly wished for and at the same time deserved by her.

Next comes Saṁsthānaka better known as Śakāra so called on account of his characteristic substitution of the *palatal ś* for the *dental s*. His is a unique personality in the whole field of Sanskrit dramatic literature. He is introduced to us as Cārudatta's co-suitor seeking Vasantasenā's hand per force and thus presents a good contrast to him. At first sight his quaint appearance and mannerisms and the peculiar absurdities of his speech appeal to us as pleasing and humorous to some extent. Particularly attracting are his topsy-turvy inroads on mythology[55] and dandy-like boasts[56] coupled with a timidity[57] peculiar to himself. By and by, however, as we get a deeper look into his mean qualities, we get more disgusted with him, till at last we can't but shudder at such a villainous knave. Thus we come to know of the vanity and his contempt of Cārudatta owing to his poverty,[58] pride of wealth and his connection with the king which he would use for any purpose, fair or foul,[59] his conceit and consequent utter disregard for others, even for their lives,[60] lust and meanness arising out of it which makes him strangle Vasantasenā and father his crime on Cārudatta,[61] his absence of scruples[62] and abjectness[63]—all these as they come out one by one make him a repulsive figure so much so that even the humour that arises out of his speech and mannerisms becomes grim and shuddering. His humourous exchange[64] of questions and answers in act I, for example, is pleasing enough; but that in Act VIII is far from it.[65] Outwardly he appears to be a fool; but he is in fact a combination of a fool and a knave. He has shown this side of his character in sending away *viṭa* and *ceṭa* (Act VIII), or in fettering *ceṭa* in his balcony (Act VIII), or turning tables on his *ceṭa* (Act X). He displays the lowest level of abjectness common to such characters

when he seeks protection from those very persons whom he has injured and insulted most. Only Cārudatta would forgive him, not even Vasantasenā.[66] If Cārudatta is praised and respected by all except Śakāra, Śakāra himself is condemned and hated by all (including his own servants) with the solitary exception of his own dignified self. His *viṭa* has very finely described him in a small couplet[67] which describes his character as appropriately as another usually quoted couplet[68] describes his *bhāṣā* or *vacana*.

Maitreya, the vidūṣaka of our play, is not the conventional *vidūṣaka* of the Sanskrit drama. He has a peculiar appearance and a peculiar stick.[69] His references to and partiality for eatables,[70] and receiving religious gifts, his blockheadedness[71] to some extent, his quaint similes[72] often referring to himself, his caste, &c., his peculiar mannerisms and jokes at his own cost in several cases and his usual timidity[73] are some of the characteristics he has in common with the *vidūṣaka* of other plays. He is also a friend and confidante of the hero. But there are many points in which he differs from the conventional *vidūṣaka*. He is first of all a staunch friend of the hero and stands by him even in his bad days[74] when all other friends have forsaken him. He is proud of his friend Cārudatta to such an extent that he would take cudgels for him as soon as he finds any one giving him the slightest insult.[75] He is ready to do any thing for his friend, particularly to give him relief.[76] At times he is very simple and with his queer questions at odd times creates humour.[77] His general knowledge is very scanty[78] and is so much habituated to receiving gifts that even on receiving a *nyāsa* he would utter his usual formula.[79] He is, however, too practical, almost to the point of selfishness.[80]

But sometimes his love and regard for his friend evokes from him some sound counsel,[81] which however he would not press too far. Like a practical man of the world, he does not care much for integrity and is prepared for any falsehood[82] if that would save him from some calamity. He has also a knack for creating humour[83] and relieve the tension of a situation. His method of looking at matters is rather superficial.[84] He can hardly go behind appearances. Naturally, therefore, he is hasty in his judgments and at the same time very prompt and outspoken in expressing them.[85] Though easily irritable he is yet easy to cool down.[86] But the most notable of all is his fidelity to his friend which he has proved by offering to give his own life to save that of Cārudatta.[87] He presents a good foil to Cārudatta's character whose virtues of piety and integrity stand out brightly on the back-ground of the counsels offered to him by Maitreya on several occasions.

Dhūtā and Rohasena appear before us only once. But they at once impress us with their extra-ordinary qualities. Dhūtā is an ideal Hindu wife who would care for her husband before any thing else and would look more to his name and reputation than to his physical safety.[88] For it she would part with even her most valuable treasure and would look upon her husband as her most precious and proud ornament.[89] Rohasena is a simple child and yet would not own Vasantasenā as his mother since she is laden with ornaments,[90] and would not accept the ornaments from her unless she wipes away her tears.[91] The second time that he appears on the stage is towards the close of Act X where he shows his worth by offering himself to the caṇḍālas to save his father.[92] It is in the interpolated section in the same act again that

we see him with his mother on the stage. There Dhūtā shows her cleverness in argument when she justifies her action before Maitreya[93] as also Cārudatta.[94] Their joy to see Cārudatta is simply indescribable ; and her greeting of Vasantasenā is not the less striking.

Madanikā, a maid of Vasantasenā, is very clever and shrewd ; and has won the heart of her mistress by intelligently reading her mind. She, like her mistress, has very high regard for Cārudatta and is sorry to learn that her lover Śarvilaka has committed a theft at his place. She is, however, relieved to know that none there is injured. She is deeply in love with Śarvilaka and has the keenness[95] of intellect to show him the way out of the difficulty into which he had thrown himself. Her thoughts are worthy of a high-born lady as remarked by Vasantasenā herself.[96] She is amply rewarded by getting her freedom and also the position of a *vadhū* by her marriage with Śarvilaka.

Śarvilaka, a brāhmaṇa by birth, son of a man well-versed in the four Vedas, has fallen in love with Madanikā, the maid of Vasantasenā.[97] Not having the money wherewith to secure her freedom, he committed a theft at Cārudatta's house.[98] He is an adept in the art and science of thievery and has done his work quite artistically so much so that Cārudatta himself admired his skill.[99] He is, of course, rather rash and hasty[100] by temperament, though even in his not a very commendable profession he has always scrupulously observed a code of honour.[101] The most important trait to note about him is his love of a friend. It was just after his marriage with Madanikā that he heard of his friend Āryaka being imprisoned by Pālaka ; and at once he hastened to his rescue, leaving his wife to go home with some other friend of his.[102] Credit in this respect is also due to Madanikā for

allowing him to go without the slightest word of disapproval.

Among the gamblers Saṁvāhaka represents the ordinary type. He is the son of a headman of a town, has studied shampooing as an art and had to use it for livelihood at Cārudatta's house.[103] With the latter's poverty however he turned out a gambler and came to a very miserable plight from which fortunately he was relieved by Vasantasenā. Being disgusted with the ways of the world he then turned out a monk[104] and had later on an opportunity of saving Vasantasenā from her danger. He, however, was firm in his resolve and is at last made the head of all *vihāras*.[105] The other gambler Darduraka is a confirmed rogue who has defied the gambling master on some former occasion and is not now afraid to seize the bull by the horns.[106] He naturally has a sort of sympathy for the gamblers as such and hence rushes up to the help of saṁvāhaka. He is even ready to pick up a quarrel with the *sabhika* and actually crosses not only words but even hands with him. Persons like him are a queer mixture of good and bad; and are generally fit for being revolutionaries that he ultimately has become.[107]

Of the two police officers, there is at first not much to discriminate. But the one is naturally soft-minded and has deep regard for Cārudatta. The other in his duty would not regard even his father.[108] Candanaka promises protection to Āryaka (seated in Cārudatta's cart) and to keep it, picks up a quarrel with his colleague, Vīraka and even strikes him. He also gives Āryaka a sword and thus helps him actively. Vīraka, on the other hand, like a confirmed police officer goes to the court with a complaint against his companion. Both,

however, are alike in their manner of speaking and abusing eath other.[109]

The two caṇḍālas again differ from one another in that the one is soft-hearted like Candanaka while the other is only a confirmed caṇḍāla not caring for anything before his duty. Of course both of them have a heart,[110] but the one is all respect for Cārudatta and has to take the other to task for addressing Cārudatta in a disrespectful manner.[111] Both are adept in their business,[112] but one of them is a considerate fellow; and would not execute a culprit instantaneously, but wait for some time in obedience to his deceased father's instruction.[113]

The Viṭa of Śakāra is well accomplished, and cultured in his manners, presenting a good contrast to his master. Though serving Śakāra, he is fully aware of his worth and has a very correct idea about him.[114] He is all respect for Cārudatta owing to his qualities[115] and is never afraid of confessing it to his master's face. He has also regard for Vasantasenā and tries to help her when he knows that she is in love with Cārudatta.[116] Being pious he not only refuses to commit a crime, but expresses his strong disapproval of शकार's deed and finding that शकार is trying to father his crime on him, he leaves him and joins शर्विलक and others. (p.246). Vasantasenā's viṭa is equally well-accomplished as can be seen from his description of the rains and his advice to Vasantasenā[117] when she went to Cārudatta.

Radanikā, Cārudatta's maid, is a faithful servant who would swallow anything for the sake of her master; Sthāvaraka, Śakāra's *ceṭa*, though low by status, is yet a man of high thoughts and piety.[118] Even on being beaten and inspite of tempting bribes he is not prepared to commit any thing wrong or immoral. He would better die than do some thing criminal or immoral.[119] Cāru-

datta's ceṭa, Vardhamānaka, on the other hand, is an ordinary man who would serve his master very faithfully. Karṇapūraka, Vasantasenā's ceṭa, is brave and bold, but a bit proud. He is naturally elated at having received a present from such a personality as Cārudatta. The judge is not very well disposed towards Śakāra and hence tries to put off his case if possible. This, however, he could not do within his rights, with the natural result that he has to yield to Śakāra's threat.[120] This need not be taken as a blemish on the judge's character: for he has acquitted himself quite impartially and ably throughout the trial of Cārudatta. We have no ground to suppose that he would yield to any proposal which Śakāra would make with a similar threat. In fact he has discarded Śakāra's suggestion more than once.[121] Vasantasenā's mother impresses us as a good old lady who has appreciated her daughter's choice.[122] Her goodness becomes apparent when she sets aside her own sorrow and tries to save Cārudatta.[123] We almost forget that she once upon a time had asked her daughter to accept the suit of Śakāra.[124] Pālaka is a despot and Āryaka, a poor cow-boy, destined to be a king, is presented to us as a fugitive from Pālaka's prison, who on being enthroned remembers all that have helped him at their own risk and amply rewards them through his friend Śarvilaka. Not much need be said of the *śreṣṭhin*, the *kāyastha*, and *śodhanaka* who have helped the judge in their own way putting questions to Cārudatta, and Vasantasenā's mother, and expressing their approval of the views stated by the judge.

We have thus seen that Śūdraka has given us not only a very large number and a large variety of characters, but has also shown great skill in depicting and developing them. Even the minor characters have

been given some traits which at once make them easily distinguishable from one another. Character-painting has in fact been said to be one of the chief virtues of Śūdraka's dramatic art. Ryder writes ' Sūdraka alone, in the long line of Indian dramatists, has a cosmopolitan character. Śakuntalā is a Hindu maid, Mādhava is a Hindu hero; but Saṁsthānaka and Maitreya and Madanikā are citizens of the world'.[125] Evidently the hero and the heroine of our play, in the eye of Ryder, are not citizens of the world. Nor could he say the same about the minor characters such as the ceṭas, the viṭas, the caṇḍālas who have time and again expressed their faith in the other world, doctrine of karman, caste-system which are peculiarly Hindu ideas. No such ideas have been expressed by Maitreya, Madanikā and Saṁsthānaka. The qualities possessed by them may be found to be possessed by persons in any land and climate of the world. This intensely (or selfishly) practical bent of mind, humour, staunch fidelity to a friend, impetuosity, shrewdness, sharpness of intellect, foolishness combined with knavery and egotism are characteristics which are not the monopoly of this or that land. They are virtues or vices that are common to mankind all the world over. It is from this point of view that the three above-mentioned characters are citizens of the world. But that does not mean that they are non-Hindus. In fact even these characters are breathing the same atmosphere—the Hindu atmosphere—and represent the same society as the rest with this difference that while a Cārudatta or a Vasantasenā can be found only among the Hindus, a Maitreya or a Madanikā or a Saṁsthānaka may be found not only among the Hindus, but among any peoples in any part of the world.

CHAPTER V

SOURCES

Even after a critical appreciation of the plot and a study of characters in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* it will not be possible to get a correct idea of Sūdraka's worth as a dramatist unless and until we know the raw material on which he worked, the several innovations (of commission or omission) that he has introduced therein, and the skill with which and the extent to which he has been able to enhance the interest of the original material or detract from it. Hence it is that while studying a play, or any work of art in fact, a knowledge of the author's sources and a study thereof is highly essential. When we speak of the sources of a dramatist we generally refer to the original from where the author borrowed his plot or story as a whole or several parts thereof, and also the use of particular things or situations, and technicalities including technical words, phrases and ideas. And for this we may be required to glance through the epics, the *purāṇas*, the works of older poets, and technical works on different sciences. It is after finding out all such sources tackled by an author and a proper comparison of the original with what the author has created out of it that we can form a proper estimate of his workmanship.

With these remarks let us now turn to the sources of the *Mṛcchakaṭika.* It has been pointed out that there are several parallels to the several incidents in the Mṛcchakaṭika to be found in other classical works—particularly the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva and the *Daśakumāracarita* of Daṇḍin. Thus the idea of a *gaṇikā* falling in love with a poor *brāhmaṇa* is found in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*[1] where *Rupaṇikā* falls in love with a poor

brāhmaṇa named *Lohajaṅgha* even against the remonstrances of her mother who thereon contrives to send the poor *brāhmaṇa* away and is later on avenged by him. Similar[2] is the story of Kumudikā falling in love with a poor *brāhmaṇa* who is imprisoned by the king of Ujjayini and is afterwards set free by the same king when he is re-established on the throne after a temporary dethronement. A similar story we get in the *Daśakumāracarita*[3] where *Rāgamañjarī's* love for a poor honest brāhmaṇa youth is opposed by her mother who is brought round with the king's help.

Here we may say that Śūdraka may have derived several details of his story from, not the *Daśakumāracarita* or the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, but the *Bṛhatkathā* on which the latter is based. Thus there are (i) a *gaṇikā* falling in love with a poor brāhmaṇa youth; (ii) the love opposed by her mother; (iii) a king's dethronement and re-establishment; and (iv) king's help in bringing about the union. In the *Mṛcchakaṭika* Śūdraka has borrowed the first; and has utilised the rest in his own way. Thus mother's opposition is almost suppressed and is turned into almost an approval. The third is divided into two parts; and one king is dethroned and assassinated, and another is established in his place. The last is also utilised to raise the heroine to the status of a *vadhū* and thus help the union. But it is evident that Śūdraka has done much more than giving us these dry details. He has invented several incidents and articles, charged them with dramatic interest of their own, and thus put new life into the original.

A close similarity is also observable between our play and the *Śākuntala*. Śakuntalā, beside herself with love for Duṣyanta, offends, of course unwittingly, the

wrathful sage Durvāsas and thus brings herself intc trouble from which she is saved by good luck. Vasanta-senā also in a similar mood kicks and spurns Śakāra and thus gets strangled; but is helped and revived by good luck in the form of Saṁvāhaka. Similarly we see the idea of two unions in both the plays. But our play differs from the *Śākuntala* in that in it all the initiative is taken by the hero while in our play it is almost all taken by the heroine.

The *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*[4] also has several parallels with our play. Particularly noticeable in this connection are the prologue, the scene of Rākṣasa's conviction in Act V and the scene at the impaling station of the *Mudrā-Rākṣasa* which correspond to the prologue, the trial scene (Act IX) and the last act of our play respectively. It may, however, be observed that the former shows us the hero under trial like the hero in our play, but does not sentence him to death. It is the hero's friend that has the death sentence there, whereas in our play the friend is instrumental in deciding the case against the hero and bringing the death sentence on him.

Inspite of all such similarities[5] that we may be able to trace between our play on the one hand and other works in Sanskrit literature on the other, it is not possible to declare definitely that Śūdraka is the borrower in all these cases. The *Mudrā-Rākṣasa* is generally accepted as being influenced by the *Mṛcchakaṭika*; while if there are some who would place Śūdraka before Kālidāsa, others are not wanting who would place Kālidāsa before him.

The discovery of Bhāsa's plays, particularly the *Daridra-Cārudatta* about thirty years ago, has created fresh

problems in this connection. There are now few who would doubt the authenticity of these plays ; but opinion is divided as regards the date of Bhāsa who is thus tossed to and fro between nothing less than about fifteen centuries. More important for us, however, is the striking parallel that the *Daridra-Cārudatta* presents to our play. As we have it at present the *Daridra-Cārudatta* has only four acts ; and strangely enough we notice the agreement between that play and ours to such an extent as to enforce on us the conclusion of one of them being the borrower.

An intensive study of the *Daridra-Cārudatta* gives an impression that it is incomplete[6] and that its author desired to continue it further. This impression is further confirmed by external evidence in the form of references[7] to it made by other writers showing that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Daridra-Cārudatta* are two different plays which have almost the same plot developed on lines very similar to each other. Under these circumstances it becomes absolutely necessary to subject both these plays to an intense scrutiny with a view to determine if possible which of these is the borrower. This has been done in two ways. Some scholars studied the similarities between the two plays while others did the same with their dissimilarities. Those who think that they have established great antiquity for Bhāsa on other independent grounds are simply interested in making out a case of borrowing between the two plays which, according to them, would automatically prove Śūdraka's indebtedness to Bhāsa. Others, however, holding that Bhāsa's antiquity cannot be established beyond all doubt on any of the grounds put forth by its protagonists, go deeper into the question of the mutual relation between the two plays by instituting an enquiry not of

similarities but of dissimilarities between them. These have been classed under four different heads: (i) Technique, (ii) Prākrit, (iii) Versification, and (iv) Dramatic incident. The findings on these scores have been briefly summarised by Dr. Sukthankar as follows :—

'Briefly summarised, the significant differences between the two versions discussed above are the following: Firstly, in point of technique, the *Cārudatta* differs conspicuously from the other play in the absence of the *nāndī*, and in having a rudimentary *sthāpanā*. Secondly, the Prākrit of the *Cārudatta* is more archaic than that of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, in so far that the former contains a number of Old-Prākrit forms not found in the latter. Thirdly, as regards versification, the text of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* marks an advance upon the other play in the following directions: rectification of grammatical mistakes; elimination of redundancies and awkward constructions; and introduction of other changes which may be claimed to be improvements in the form and substance of the verses. Fourthly and lastly, because of suitable additions and omissions the Mṛcchakaṭika presents a text free from many of the flaws, such as unrealities and inconsistencies, in the action of the *Cārudatta*.'[8] 'Taking all things into account, we conclude, we can readily understand the evolution of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version from a *Cārudatta* version, but not *vice versa*. The special appeal of this hypothesis lies in the fact that it explains not merely isolated variations, but whole categories of them; it implies the formulation of a single uniform principle to explain diverse manifestations.'[9]

If thus Śūdraka's indebtedness to Cārudatta is established and accepted, there crops up the question as to his claim to originality which is suggested by the name

prakaraṇa[10] that he gives to his play. For according to writers on Sanskrit dramaturgy the plot of a *prakaraṇa* should be *utpādya* (as opposed to *prakhyāta*).[11] In this connection, however, it may be observed that whether the plot originally belongs to the one or the other of the plays, it must be admitted that it is not *prakhyāta* there. Hence it should not be looked upon as being *prakhyāta* in the other play also. Śūdraka's dramatic skill and originality, moreover, is clearly seen from the various changes that he has introduced into the original in order to improve upon it. Thus to note only a few of them : (i) The *Mṛcchakaṭika* invariably offers better readings in the verses common to the two plays and shows better judgment by placing the verses in a better and more suitable context. (ii) At the end of the first scene in act I Śūdraka has kept Cārudatta engaged in *samādhi* while the second scene is going on. This has no counterpart in the Cārudatta, which, therefore, causes a serious break there. (iii) Śūdraka makes Vasantasenā send Madanikā away to fetch a fan which gives Śarvilaka an opportunity to see and call her. In the *Cārudatta* strangely enough Sajjalaka loudly calls out to Madanikā from outside while she is with Vasantasenā. This is not only inconsistent and illogical but, if we take into consideration the circumstances, the height of indiscretion. (iv) The *Mṛcchakaṭika* drops all the *tithi* references and thus saves the play from discrepancies in the time-scheme to which the *Cārudatta* has exposed itself.

It may thus be observed that the author of the *Cārudatta* got a few points and ideas in his plot from the earlier sources and has worked them out into a play of high dramatic interest (fragment as it is) which from references in other works seems to have developed on lines

similar to the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. High credit must, therefore, be given to Bhāsa the author of the *Cārudatta*, for the high skill he has exhibited in composing this drama. Credit is also due to Śūdraka, as we have seen, for instituting several changes which invariably have tended to make the *Mṛcchakaṭika* appear as an improvement on the *Cārudatta*. In the absence of complete manuscripts of the *Cārudatta*, however, it is not possible to get a very accurate idea of all the details in which Śūdraka has improved upon the Cārudatta, and we must, therefore, rest satisfied with the tentative conclusion that Śūdraka derived a great portion of his material in the *Cārudatta* which, however, he found marred with several defects. He, therefore, thought of improving on it and has given us the present Mṛcchakaṭika which in several of its features stands unique in the whole field of Sanskrit dramatic literature.[12]

CHAPTER VI

ŚŪDRAKA AS A DRAMATIST

Several factors have combined to raise the *Mṛcchakaṭika* to a unique position in the field of Sanskrit dramatic literature. The interest of the main story of love between Vasantasenā and Cārudatta well-knit and interwoven with the sub-plot of the revolution and the episodes of Saṁvāhaka, Śarvilaka and Karṇapūraka is very well kept up till the very end by various devices such as humour, contrast and suspense, various articles charged with dramatic interest, and well-balanced arrangement of acts and scenes.

The prologue, as we have already observed contains some verses which could not have been composed by Śūdraka himself. Even if these are left out of account, the prologue not only does the work of introducing the poet and the play but also gives us some idea of the main plot and also an inkling of the sub-plot, and at the same time attracts the attention of the spectators by its peculiar humour, (which, in fact, is the forte of the Mṛcchakaṭika) and holds it till the very end. Let us try to see how Śūdraka has been successful in achieving this end.

Variation, it may be remembered, is the commonest and yet the most important means of creating and sustaining interest. Monotony tends to be dull and mars interest ; and variation of every sort is the best way to kill it. Variation of prose and verse, or of Sanskrit and Prakrit (or Prakrits), or dialogues, monologues, and soliloquies are the most usual types of variation so far as the medium of thought in a play is concerned. Śūdraka

like a skilled playwright has made use of all these types in his play with a keen sense of proportion so that none of these has been allowed to be too predominant to be tedious. Dialogue is, of course, the chief channel. But even there we have the variation of the length of the sentences, or their types, and also the style in which they are written. Thus we have variation and alternation of dialogues of short or long sentences, or of questions and answers, and mere statements or exclamations, or of simple, compound and complex sentences. Variation caused by change in the order of words or by use of the verbal and nominal forms is too simple to be mentioned.

But one important point to be remembered and noted in this connection is the avoidance of long speeches. The duty and aim of a dramatist is to hold mirror to nature ; and hence his first care should be to avoid any thing that would mar the verisimilitude of his play. Hence it is that a playwright should as far as possible avoid the use of long speeches. This can be and very often has been done by various devices ; and the most common is to make some *dramatis persona* ask some pertinent question or pass some pertinent remarks at intervals. With this device a long speech can be turned into a series of short speeches or into a dialogue and the unnatural phenomenon of one character making a long speech and others remaining dumb on the stage be avoided. And yet it must be noted that the questions or remarks thus introduced must be quite natural, relevant and useful. Otherwise they themselves would constitute a blemish by marring the verisimilitude.

Soliloquies by themselves are not unnatural. For very often in our daily life we do find ourselves (and also others) in a brooding mood—a mood of thinking to

oneself. Sometimes again it happens that we are quite silent outwardly and yet a storm is raging in our brain, or we may be stating something and yet we may be thinking quite differently to ourselves. All these are cases of the stage direction *svagatam* which in a drama, therefore, can claim a place by right. These soliloquies serve a great purpose by revealing to us the innermost heart of the speaker and thus help us to judge of him or her. But to some extent at least the dramatic soliloquies can't but be unnatural for the soliloquies in ordinary life are never heard by any body while those in a drama are heard by the spectators. Hence if soliloquies are introduced in a very large number they are bound to mar the interest of the spectator. Soliloquies must, moreover, be short also. For what has been said of speeches above applies to soliloquies also. Dramatists, therefore, very often try to give a long soliloquy the appearance of a dialogue by the device of *ākāśabhāṣitam*. According to this device there is only one man on the stage and while speaking he looks up in the air, pretends to listen to somebody and repeating what he is supposed to have heard gives his own reply to it. This device always introduced by the stage direction *ākāśe*, is very common in Sanskrit drama, and the long speech delivered with the help of this device may be termed a monologue to distinguish it from a soliloquy which usually signifies the *svagata* speech.

Patākā-sthāna is yet another device commonly used by Sanskrit playwrights to kill monotony and at the same time to suggest or fore-shadow some future event. *Patākā-sthāna* consists of a series of utterances (comprising clauses or parts of sentences) with a different bearing altogether, which owing to the peculiar juxta-

position in which they occur convey quite a different idea which later on is actually to take place. The words in the *patākā-sthāna* are uttered by different persons who mean to convey some particular idea; and if all the words of each of the several speakers are read severally they do yield the idea properly. But if they are read or taken together in the order in which they occur irrespective of the speaker they yield a sense which suggests a future event. The *patākā-sthāna* may, in a sense, be called *dramatic irony*.

Śūdraka has made use of all these types of variation. Use of a variety of Prakrits is, in fact, a unique feature of his play. He has made even his *sūtradhāra* speak in *prākrit*. According to the commentator[1] we have in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* three prakrits (viz. *śaurasenī*, *āvantī*, and *Māgadhī*) and three *apabhraṁśas* (viz. *śakarī*, *caṇḍālī*, and *dhakkā*). More interesting, however, is the fact that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* displays prakrits of a later stage than the *Cārudatta*.[2] This can't, however, be taken as a ground strong enough to determine by itself the chronology and provenance of these plays. For a detailed scrutiny has shown that the condition of the *prākrits* in manuscripts of the plays is determined not so much by the date and provenance of the plays themselves as by the date and provenance of the manuscripts. As illustrative of Śūdraka's use of variation we may note the humorous questions and answers between Maitreya and Śakāra (Act I), Kumbhīlaka and Maitreya (Act V), and Śakāra and Ceṭa (Acts VI & VIII) where we have only a series of simple sentences, and which are followed by dialogue in longer and complex sentences. As for *svagata* speeches also it may be observed that he has used them on several occasions no doubt, but has never

made them lengthy. The same may be said about what we have termed monologues, as illustrations of which we may refer to Darduraka's speech when he steps forth to save Saṁvāhaka (Act II), Saṁvāhaka's speech as he starts out of Vasantasenā's house (Act II), and Sthāvaraka's speech before he parks his cart at Cārudatta's house (Act VI). It may be observed that Śūdraka has used the stage direction *ākarṇya* instead of or side by side with the usual *ākāśe*.[3]

We may also note the long soliloquies. Take, for example, the long speech of Saṁsthānaka in Act X when he appears on his balcony as Cārudatta is being led to the cemetery,[4] or his speech again after strangling Vasantasenā and getting rid of ceṭa and viṭa in Act VIII,[5] which are used for giving out to us the further plans of the speaker and as such appear to be quite natural as well as essential. But even here, it should be noted, Śūdraka has tried to avoid the impression of a lengthy speech or mere lecture by introducing some actions by means of several stage directions. The more noteworthy, however, are the soliloquies of Śarvilaka (act III) giving the various details of the art and science of thievery and a description in full details of the actual robbery that he is committing there.[6] This speech saves the whole scene from being a mere *tableau* and is itself saved from being a mere lecture by the action accompanying it. The description of the rains[7] in Act V has its justification perhaps in the emotional nature of Cārudatta and in the poetical convention of the sight of clouds enhancing love longing. The same emotional nature is perhaps responsible for Cārudatta's musings on poverty, time and again. In general it may be said that soliloquies are utilised by Śūdraka to show the working of the speaker's

mind and that he has varied the length of these soliloquies in proportion to the emotion and the emotional nature of the person and the situation concerned ; and lastly that the soliloquy runs in the channels of verse or poetry when the emotion is at a very high pitch.

Let us now turn to the device of *patākā-sthāna* described above. Śūdraka has given us a fine instance[8] of it in Act I when Cārudatta and Maitreya both express their views regarding the *nyāsa* of Vasantasenā, by arranging their words in such a way as to suggest their being stolen away ere long (Act III).

Having thus far discussed the medium of thought and its variations, we now pass on to the thought itself or the plot of the play and consider the sequence adopted therein by Śūdraka. Sequence is either chronological or artistic. In the former, events are narrated in the order in which they actually take place while in the latter the author starts with some point (towards the middle or the end of the story) and very artistically supplies all the previous details by various devices. This latter is very well illustrated by Viśākhadatta in his *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*.[9] Śūdraka has, however, adopted the former mode, but for only one incident cleverly introduced through Śakāra[10] in the very first act. But for this the sequence in our play is strictly chronological. This has, however, taxed the author's ingenuity to a large extent ; for very often it has happened that some of the events in his plot are simultaneous or nearly so and some consecutive events are taking place at different places requiring a sudden shifting of scenes. These difficulties Śūdraka has tried to tide over not without success in almost all places, though there are some places where he could not do so very successfully.

Thus, for example, in Act I the third scene is a direct continuation of the first and the second takes place between the two. Śūdraka has very skilfully managed this by engaging Cārudatta in meditation and thus allowing the required time for the second scene without a tinge of unnaturalness. Similarly in Act IV he has very cleverly and, of course, naturally spared some time for Madanikā and Śarvilaka to have their meeting and hatch their plan by making Vasantasenā hide herself behind her lattices and overhear them again quite in the natural course. A third illustration is found in Act VIII where the monk is introduced on the stage at either end and is kept away in the interval between them (apparently washing his *cīvara*) just to make room for Śakāra to perpetrate his heinous crime. The same skill is again shown by Śūdraka when at the end of Act VIII he makes the monk take Vasantasenā with the suggestion that she should rest in a vihāra near-by till she felt all right and then go her own way. During this interval it is that the trial is conducted, Cārudatta is sentenced and is actually led to the cemetery (covering the whole of Act IX and a major portion of Act X). It is his judicious choice of details to be represented on the stage that has helped Śūdraka a good deal in overcoming the difficulties referred to above.

And yet it must be observed that some cases have baffled all his skill in this direction. Take, for example, the events of Acts VI-VIII. In Act VI Sthāvaraka goes with Śakāra's cart (with Vasantasenā therein) earlier than Vardhamānaka driving Cārudatta's cart (carrying Āryaka). The latter is again hampered on the way by Vīraka and Candanaka for inspection, whereas the former has no such incident to cause any delay. We, there-

fore, naturally expect Sthāvaraka to reach the *Puṣpa-karaṇḍaka* garden earlier—much earlier—than Vardhamānaka who is also to go to the same garden. Actually, however, Śūdraka has changed the order and represented Vardhamānaka reaching the place and the consequent rescue of Āryaka in an earlier Act and Sthāvaraka reaching the place and the strangling of Vasantasenā in the next act. And there appears to be nothing in these acts to explain this irregularity, except perhaps the *nāsārajju-kaṭukatva* of the latter's bulls and the *pariśrāntatva* of the former. These factors if construed as telling on the speed of the respective carts may perhaps enable us to understand the resulting events as taking place almost simultaneously or in close succession to one another, but represented on the stage one after the other owing to their incompatibility with one another and independent dramatic interest. If this view is accepted we can easily see why the present order of these events is adopted by Śūdraka. For the *Āryakāpaharaṇa* (Act VII) is a direct continuation of the closing scene of Act VI; while *Vasantasenāmoṭana* gives a direct sequence to Acts IX and X.

Numerous indeed are the places where this chronological sequence adopted by Śūdraka has caused sudden shift of scenes, which mars the unity of action particularly when the scenes thus shifting are ridiculously short. Take, for example, the scene[11] where Madanikā takes the bracelet from Vasantasenā and goes out to give it to Māthura in payment of Saṁvāhaka's dues, which is to take place outside Vasantasenā's house while the scenes on either side of it are to take place inside it. Or take the scene[12] where Cārudatta, of course through mistake, asks Vasantasenā to cover his son and take him in. This scene naturally is taking place in the outer

part of Cārudatta's house while the scene just preceding it is taking place just outside the house at the door almost on the road. This difficulty would be greatly felt in Act VI where the scenes are constantly moving inside and outside Cārudatta's house and the street adjoining it,[13] or in Act III where the scene has suddenly shifted within Cārudatta's house itself from the outer chamber to the inner apartment and back again to it in no time.[14] Such sudden shifts certainly tax the spectator's imagination to an incredible extent in the absence of requisite stage arrangements. The abundance of such cases in a play like the *Mṛcchakaṭika* should, therefore, be taken as indicative of the existence of such stage arrangements as would make the representation of such scenes possible without much strain on the spectator's imagination.

One more point that we have to note in this connection is that Śūdraka has chosen only such events as are of high dramatic significance and avoided altogether every thing dry and insipid with the result that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* has no interludes at all. Whatever incidents are necessary have been actually represented on the stage or in some cases hinted at in the actual scenes without having recourse to interludes. Sometimes Śūdraka achieves this by resorting to the stage direction *nepathye*.[15] Thus the fact that Vasantasenā has entered the *abhyantara* of Cārudatta's house and remained there that night and that Cārudatta has arranged for Vasantasena's going to the *Puṣpakaraṇḍaka* garden to sport with him (between Acts V & VI), or the fact that Vasantasenā rested in a *vihāra* with a nun till she was all right (after VIII), or Āryaka's imprisonment by king Pālaka, his rescue by Śarvilaka, or the assassination of Pālaka

and Āryaka's enthronement—all these are only a few illustrations in point.

After judicious selection of details comes the problem of dividing and arranging them into scenes and acts ; and Śūdraka's skill is clearly seen here by the use of contrast that he has made all through. Thus we find the serious and the light or humorous scenes alternating one another ; and what is true of scenes may also to some extent be said of acts. We also have alternation of the serene and the boisterous, as for example the pursuit of Vasantasenā by Śakāra and his troop in Act I, the pursuit of Saṁvāhaka and his rescue by Darduraka in Act II, or the Karṇapūraka incident in the same Act, or the quarrel between Candanaka and Vīraka in Act VI. Alternation of such scenes goes a long way to sustain the spectator's interest and adds to Śūdraka's merit as a dramatist. The Acts are arranged in a peculiar manner so that the scenes in the first five acts are laid alternately in the house (with the precincts and the adjoining road) of Cārudatta and Vasantasenā ; the sixth is on the highway between Cārudatta's house and the Puṣpakaraṇḍaka garden ; the next two in the garden itself, the nineth in the court and the last on the highway and the southern cemetery. The element of contrast has also been used by Śūdraka when he introduces Cārudatta and Śakāra, Darduraka and Saṁvāhaka, in close succession, or Śakāra and vita or Vīraka and Candanaka simultaneously.

But the important element that we have to note in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is the suspense and curiosity which have regular ups and downs and thus serve to hold the spectator's interest upto the end. In the first five acts this element seems to be used but in patches. Thus we feel it for the first time when we see Vasantasenā pursued

by Śakāra and his men and are relieved to see her get into Cārudatta's house. A similar suspense we experience in Act II in the case of Saṁvāhaka. But beyond this we don't get any real suspense in these acts though there is always an undercurrent of suspense all the while about Cārudatta and Vasantasenā who love one another and yet whose love seems to be beset with more difficulties than one, the most anxious one being in the form of Śakāra. Once we know in Act I that Śakāra is Cārudatta's rival in love of Vasantasenā we are anxious to know how anything that comes up before us in the succeeding Acts is connected with it and is calculated to solve the riddle. It is this feeling that creates an undercurrent of suspense in all the Acts up to the fifth, though outwardly we see the love heading towards consummation step by step. The real and continuous suspense, however, begins from Act VI which with the rapidity of events goes through ups and downs, often seems to reach a climax, gets a temporary relief, and is ultimately relieved fully in the end.

The next element that contributes not a little to Śūdraka's success is his skilful use of things and events. He has introduced the *jasmine scented mantle*, the *ornaments*, and the *jewel necklace* and invested them with a dramatic significance of their own, made them pass through several hands, and help the plot at every step in the most natural manner. Even the jasmine scent is not without a purpose as we clearly see when in Act III Vasantasenā identifies the mantle got as a present by Karṇapūraka from Cārudatta.[16] Again it is the scent that enhances Vasantasenā's longing[17] for Cārudatta in Act I. The mantle itself introduced quietly in the very beginning as a present[18] to Cārudatta from his friend

Jūrṇavṛddha is thrown by him towards Vasantasenā mistaking her for Radanikā, the latter actually puts it on,[19] then it remains with Cārudatta who bestows it on Karṇapūraka for bravely rescuing a monk from a mad elephant.[20] At this last stage in its travel it reveals Cārudatta's appreciative nature and magnanimity. It is then recognized and taken over by Vasantasenā thus revealing again the high pitch her love for Cārudatta has reached. The *ratnâvalī* is brought before us as suddenly as its owner Dhūtā resolved to part with it to save her husband's *cāritra*. Of course, we know that it belongs to a *kulastrī* and is as such *aprakāśa*. We are also told that it is a mother's gift to Dhūtā.[21] This necklace goes from Dhūtā to Cārudatta, and from him to Vasantasenā (through Maitreya in both the cases), and with her back to Cārudatta's house again. At the first stage it reveals Dhūtā's magnanimity and devotion to her husband; at the second it throws light on Cārudatta's integrity, and affords Vasantasenā an excuse for paying a visit to Cārudatta and at the same time enhances her love for him; while at the last stage it helps to bring Cārudatta and Vasantasenā nearer than ever and be ready for the consummation of their love which is so to say now awaiting them.[22]

But while the *ratnāvalī* and the *prāvāraka* have an important role in the first part of the play and help the development of Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta and ultimately lead to their union in Act V, the *Suvarṇabhāṇḍa* introduced in Act I has far greater importance and hand in moulding the events and the plot till the very end of Act IX. It also has some side effects which also are worth noting. Thus the ornaments are deposited by Vasantasenā with Cārudatta with a very plau-

sible excuse and give her an opportunity to come into greater contact with him. In Act III they are stolen and thus serve to bring out Cārudatta's magnanimity and readiness and desire to be of use to others even at one's own cost and risk, and also his integrity and determination to preserve it at any cost. In Act IV the ornaments bring about the meeting between Madanikā and Śarvilaka who fix up their plan to return them to their proper owner. They are overheard by Vasantasenā who on receiving the ornaments from Śarvilaka unites him with his beloved Madanikā. Here then they bring about the union between a loving couple, deepen Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta, and qualifies her to read behind the message which Cārudatta sends along with the ratnāvalī and thus appreciate very highly the sterling quality of integrity and magnanimity. Her love is now excited to such an extent that she now throws away all restraint and decides to offer her love to Cārudatta immediately. In Act V Vasantasenā returns the ornaments to Cārudatta with a message similar to his own ; and when the latter knows the truth about it, there is joy everywhere and then comes the consummation of Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta. In the first half of the play thus the ornaments are a source of happiness and union of two loving couples. From Act VI onwards, however, matters seem to have changed. The ornaments, first of all, are an obstacle in the way of Vasantasenā being accepted as his mother by Rohasena. She, therefore, to deserve the honour takes them off and in order to appease the young child offers them to him for getting a golden toy-cart made out of them. At this stage we have not the least suspicion that these ornaments hereafter are going to bring Cārudatta in life's peril. But

that is what actually happens. For Śakāra, after strangling Vasantasenā, fathers his crime on Cārudatta in the court of law; and the circumstantial evidence as it comes to light bit by bit seems to take the case from bad to worse; and at the end these very ornaments, which Cārudatta has sent away with Maitreya to Vasantasenā, drop down from under the arm-pit of the former and finally decide the case against Cārudatta. This history of the part played by the *suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa* in the play clearly shows their great significance and we really admire Śūdraka for having conceived a thing charged with such numerous possibilities one after another.

Of the events thus utilised by Śūdraka, the episodes of Saṁvāhaka, Karṇapūraka and Śarvilaka stand supreme. The first serves the immediate purpose of bringing out cleverly to what depth Vasantasenā's love for Cārudatta has gone. But the good turn done by her to Saṁvāhaka in Act II evokes a good turn from him in Act VIII, then a monk. The episode of Karṇapūraka again serves to bring out Cārudatta's magnanimity and appreciative nature and deepens Vasantasenā's love for him. The episode of Śarvilaka is perhaps more important than the other two. It serves to bring about the union of Madanikā and Śarvilaka, shows clearly the appreciative and generous nature of Cārudatta and connects the main plot with the sub-plot. In fact, Śarvilaka is the only *dramatis persona* that figures in both the plots.

Nor is Śūdraka slow to make use of various little events. Thus error has been utilised in more places than one. In Act I Śakāra mistakes Radanikā for Vasantasenā while Cārudatta mistakes Vasantasenā for the other. In Act III Maitreya hands over the

suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa to Śarvilaka mistaking him for his friend (of course in his sleep); there is again the *pravahaṇa-viparyaya* incident in Act VI. Some of these mistakes have created humour and also helped the plot further, while the last one has very far-reaching consequences. The meditation of Cārudatta, the offering of oblations to mother deities, the moon-rise (Act I), the tattered garment of Darduraka,[23] the temple without an idol, the bleeding nose of Saṁvahaka[24] (Act II), the yajnopavita[25] (Act III & X), the painting, the gavākṣa (Act IV), the rains and lightning (Act V), forgetting the cart-cushions, giving a turn to the wheel, the bulls being restive, fetter on Āryaka's foot, the cart being veiled, the quarrel between Candanaka and Vīraka (Act VI), the thrashing of Sthāvaraka by Śakāra, the crushing of a woman by a falling tree, the absence of ornaments on Vasantasenā's body, the dried fallen leaves and wet garment (Act VIII)—are some of the events and things which again show clearly how Sūdraka is a master of the art of using things and events.[26]

Let us now pass on to a consideration of the three unities. As for the unity of place, we can see that the whole of the action in the play takes place in the city of Ujjayinī (particularly the houses of Cārudatta and Vasantasenā, their precincts and the adjoining road, the highway of Ujjayinī, the *Puṣpakaraṇḍaka* garden and the southern cemetery). We have already seen the scene of action for each of the acts separately and have observed that Śūdraka has carefully observed the unity of place by keeping the scene restricted to an easily observable area. We have seen how this consideration has actuated him to exclude the *Āryakāpaharaṇa* incident from Act VI.[27] One point, however, has to be particu-

larly noted in this connection. An act in a Sanskrit drama is not divided into several scenes and as such forms one long scene. Unless this circumstance is perfectly borne in mind we may not be able to see how the unity of place and also the unity of action is observed by Śūdraka in his play. If we try to divide the acts into several scenes, we find that at several places we have ridiculously short scenes requiring a sudden shift of the place of action. Such constant shifting of scenes only mars the verisimilitude and hence detracts from the merits of the play. But blaming Śūdraka in this respect is like calling a dog mad and shooting him. Instead of fathering our idea of scenes on him we should rather abide by the ancient idea of the whole act being one long scene and we may find that everything is all right. For we find that in no act does the scene of action extend beyond a particular area suitably divided into two or three parts. By assuming, therefore, the stage to be divided into these respective parts we can very well see how Śūdraka has observed the unity of place within an act all through the play. The peculiar arrangement of the various scenes (in the modern sense of the term) should, therefore, be a ground for assuming a well-developed stage arrangement rather than a blemish in the art of Śūdraka. For it is but inconceivable that a playwright of such exquisite art should have committed such a blunder even in obedience to the prevailing notions of his day.[28]

Coming to the unity of time we have to note that writers on Sanskrit dramaturgy have laid down that events in an act must not exceed the duration of a day; and that all such events as do not fall within this limit should be represented in an interlude (or in a separate

act).[29] They also lay down the time limit for the events in the interlude as not exceeding one year.[30] It may be noted that Sanskrit playwrights have generally abided by these rules, though there are some who have not cared for the second. Coming to the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, we can see that no act in it contains events exceeding a day. Nor has he violated the second rule by representing events separated from one another by a long period. The events actually represented on the stage cover a period of about four days with or without a break between Act II and Act III. Śūdraka may thus be said to have observed the unity of time as required by rules of Sanskrit dramaturgy.

This brings us to an analysis of the time element in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. Reading the Mṛcchakaṭika we get the following indications of time given by Śūdraka: (i) Maitreya tells that it is *pradoṣavelā*,[31] (ii) It is pitchy dark while Vasantasenā is being pursued by Śakara,[32] (iii) The moon rises late at night.[33] (Act I). (iv) Vasantasenā is yet to take her bath;[34] (Act II); (v) Vardhamānaka remarks that it is past mid-night,[35](vi) The moon is about to set,[36] and has set actually,[37] (vii) Vidūṣaka's reference to *suvarṇa-bhāṇḍa* as *nidrā-caura*,[38] and the expression *adyāpi* in his remark on the occasion; (viii) His *utsvapna* speech; (Act III); (ix) Śarvilaka tells Madanikā that he committed the theft *adya rātrau* and that he heard about the same *prabhāte*;[39] (x) Vasantasenā is going to Cārudatta in the *pradoṣa*. (Act IV); (xi) The *durdina* is untimely,[41] (xii) Maitreya's question whether Vasantasenā intended to sleep there that night,[42] (Act V); (xiii) Vasantasenā's remark that she would see Cārudatta now, since she could not see him well over-night;[43] (xiv) Vīraka tells that Āryaka has escaped when

the sun had only partially risen,[44] (Act VI); (xv) Śakāra and his *ceṭa* speak of the time being *madhyāhna*,[45] (Act VIII); (xvi) Vīraka's remark that he passed a sleepless night,[46] (Act IX) and (xvii) Śakāra has finished his meals,[47] (Act X). From these indications one can conclude that Act I begins one day about the evening and lasts till about midnight. The events in Act II take place in the morning of the next day while the theft in Act III is committed at night (the same day or after about a fortnight). Act IV represents events of the next morning and that same evening Vasantasenā pays a visit to Cārudatta and stays with him. The events of Act VI occupy the morning of the fourth day and those of the next two acts are over before evening the same day. The trial takes place on the fifth day in the morning and the last act presumably represents action of the same evening. Thus counted without a break the action of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* continues from the evening of a day upto the noon (or evening) of the fifth day (i. e. about 96 hours).

In view of Vīraka's remark (cf. no. xvi) above it is impossible to agree with the view of Pisharoti[48] that the events of the last five acts take place on one and the same day. There is, however, a sharp difference of opinion regarding the time of Act III. Some[49] admit a short break of about a fortnight between Acts II and III which others[50] are not inclined to do. The strongest circumstance in favour of this break is the fact that while the moon is said to rise in Act I it is said to be setting in Act III about mid-night in both the cases. This necessarily shows that the events in Act I take place about the middle of the dark half while those in Act III take place about the middle of the bright half. This naturally means that the events in these acts are separated

by about a fortnight. This impression thus gathered is further strengthened by the fact that Maitreya is very much disgusted with the ornaments which have robbed him of his sleep. He wonders why they are not stolen away as yet; and is so much obsessed with them that even in sleep he is thinking about them. Others, however, lay stress on Cārudatta's statement that he would return the *nyāsa* ere long,[51] and do not admit of any interval here. They hold the conversation between Vardhamānaka and Maitreya as taking place just on the next night after the deposit,[52] and declare that in making the moon rise in Act I and set in Act III Sūdraka has overlooked the question of chronology.[53] It is true that 'we have no special hints in the play of there being an interval between Acts I & II and Act III,' only if we set aside the clear reference to the rising and the setting of the moon discussed above. It is rather difficult to understand why the reference should be brushed aside as being only erroneous. So long as a matter can find another solution it is wrong to describe it as an error or defect on the part of the playwright—particularly of the height of Śūdraka. It may here be noted that the *Mṛcchakaṭika* has dropped the direct *tithi references* which in the Cārudatta create chronological inconsistency and absurdity. This circumstance also should help us to conclude that Śūdraka must have so managed matters as to leave no room for any such inconsistency at all. In the absence of any definite clue we must leave the question of exact dates and month of the events untouched, though it is stated sometimes that the action began on or about *Māgha kṛṣṇa ṣaṣṭhī* and ended on *Phālguna śukla ekādaśī*.[54]

As for the third and the most important unity we see how Śūdraka has shown his great skill by taking

various threads and weaving them all into a fine texture. We have already discussed how the episodes of Saṁvāhaka and Śarvilaka and also that of Karṇapūraka have their own purpose to serve and help the main plot; and expressed our view regarding Ryder's opinion in that connection. Let us now turn to the relation between the sub-plot and the main plot. We have shown above how Śūdraka has occasionally given some references to the sub-plot and remarked that the sub-plot in our play is gathering strength only bit by bit just like the revolution in the world of actuality. Nothing could be more natural than this. Just as we are constantly put in mind of the main plot i. e. the love between Vasantasenā and Cārudatta, so also are we at every step reminded of the subplot viz. the political revolution. Thus we have references to it in the remark of Darduraka[54] in Act Il, of Sarvilaka[55] in Act IV, Aryaka's imprisonment and his escape from the prison[56] (Acts IV, VI), Aryaka's rescue (Act VII), and his crowning[57] (Act X). It is worth noting that Śūdraka has nowhere allowed the sub-plot to intrude on the main plot and has shown great skill finally in making its catastrophe synchronise with and to a large extent merge into that of the main plot. One really wonders whether it will be possible to have the Mṛcchakaṭika without the sub-plot, closely intermingled and interconnected or even interdependent as the events in them are at present. *Āryakāpaharaṇa* incident is absolutely necessary for heightening the greatness of Cārudatta. In the Mṛcchakaṭika we see him all along lamenting that owing to his poverty he can no longer be of any use or help to others. In fact helping others is a mania for him; and it forms his strength as well as weakness. It is this habit that heightens our regard for

him, when we find him helping Āryaka, pressing him to use his cart—inspite of the grave risk in doing so. Our regard goes to the highest pitch when we see him keeping reticent at the court lest any statement on his part would lead to Āryaka's recapture. He is willing even to die. In the absence of the sub-plot we should have lost this pitch and Cārudatta would not have stood before us the great Cārudatta that he is at present. Dr. Ryder remarks that in fact in this play we have material for two plays. We might only say that neither of these two plays would reach the greatness—nay even half the greatness—of the Mṛcchakaṭika. And there is the skill or art of Śūdraka. Is not a human body constituted of the five great elements ? But a human being is not the elements only but the elements with life added to them. Similarly the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is not merely the two plots put together, but the plots with life infused into them.

The unity of action in the Mṛcchakaṭika is sometimes said to have been marred by the sudden shifting of scenes every now and then. But it is impossible to believe that a playwright who could produce a play like the Mṛcchakaṭika should have allowed such a defect to remain in it. The better alternative is to presume a suitable stage arrangement so that the whole act may actually be only one long scene in keeping with the idea of an act according to Sanskrit dramaturgy. Similarly Dr. Ryder seems to have blown hot and cold in the same breath when he remarks : 'In the little Clay-cart we could ill afford to spare a single scene even though the very richness and variety of the play remove it from the class of world 's greatest dramas.'

One more peculiarity we have to note about the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. Before a *dramatis persona* comes on the

stage his entrance is suggested by a short introductory scene. This scene describes the person in all the details and thus serves to give us a good idea about the whole situation.[58] This in modern plays is achieved by elaborate stage directions which Śūdraka has carefully avoided. Sometimes a *dramatis persona* is introduced on the stage by some announcement from behind the curtain.[59] In such cases the stage direction *nepathye* is used.

Two more stage directions deserve special attention : (i) *Niṣkramya punaḥ praviśya,*[60] and (ii) *Nāṭyena praviṣya.* Very often when some one is sent to fetch somebody, generally the former direction is used and in a moment both the persons are seen to enter on the stage. This sudden arrival of both the persons is not true to our experience. But whenever such a situation occurs this is the usual practice of Sanskrit playwrights (including Kālidāsa),[61] just to avoid the awkwardness of making persons on the stage wait dumb for a long time. Such a device, oftener used, must be counted a blemish on the dramatist's art. The second stage direction above shows that the dramatis persona has to gesticulate entering. Does this show that actually there is nothing to enter into, and that the act of entering is only imaginary? Such in fact is the signification of *nāṭyena* wherever it occurs.[62] At any rate it must show that the stage has more parts than one and that the action of entering is from one part into another. But how these parts were actually arranged we cannot be quite definite about. That some curtain must have been used is clear from the bi-focal scene in Act III where Madanikā and Śarvilaka are having their plans and Vasantasenā is overhearing them from behind her lattices. Simi-

larly the successive short scenes in the beginning of Act VI can't be understood in the absence of such a curtain. The same must be said about Śakāra appearing in his house while Cārudatta is being led in procession to the southern cemetery. These and several other scenes like these seem to force on us the conclusion that the stage in the days of Śūdraka must have been well equipped with curtains so as to be divisible into several sections representing the inner and the outer quadrangles of a house, the outer garden, and the adjoining street, the ground and the upper storey and the tearrace.

But the most unique feature of the Mṛcchakaṭika is humour which, Ryder declares, is truly Shakespearean and runs the whole gamut from grim to farcical, from satirical to quaint. Humour in the Mṛcchakaṭika, it may be observed, arises out of (i) humorous characters, (ii) humorous situations and (iii) puns and (iv) peculiar questions and answers.

Śakāra and Maitreya are the humorous characters of Śūdraka, and give rise to different types of humour. We have already discussed the former in a previous chapter and shown how his humour though somewhat pleasing in the beginning becomes later on very grim and shuddering.[64] Such is not the case, however, with Maitreya—who inspite of his oddities is quite affable and his humour is never but innocent and on several occasions quite relieving. His exchange of questions and answers with Śakāra (Act I) and with Kumbhīlaka (Act V) is quite happy ; his topsy turvy arrangement of words[65] in his haste is equally enjoyable ; his humorous metaphors and illustrations about himself[66], about a gaṇikā[67], or about a man's musical performance[68] are peculiarly

humorous. Maitreya, as Vidūṣaka, creates humour by his very appearance and his paraphernalia. But at times he creates humour to relieve the tension of a situation as, for example, when he does by requesting Vasantasenā (Act V) to return his bathing towel[69]. Sometimes his humour is only unconscious and in such cases it arises out of his inability to appraise the situation in its true perspective[70]. But on no occasion does his humour become disgusting or unpleasant.

Equally or perhaps even more striking is the humour arising out of situations. The scene of the gambler Saṁvāhaka walking backward into a vacant temple and posing himself as the idol and the other gamblers finding out his trick and beginning their game under his very nose ultimately making him speak out is a fine specimen of such humour. The scene of Darduraka trying to evade, but at last facing boldly and even picking up a quarrel and particularly throwing dust into the eyes of Māthura is equally exhilarating. Similar is the humour arising out of the exchange of words and also the quarrel between the two police officers, though it is charged with some anxiety for Āryaka seated in Cārudatta's cart. Not the less enjoyable is again the humour when Vasantasenā asks Śarvilaka to take her return message to Cārudatta and before he can realise the whole situation, hands over Madanikā to him. Maitreya putting queer questions to the Ceṭī on behalf of his friend, Vasantasenā taking over the prāvāraka from karṇapūraka, or Maitreya requesting Vasantasenā to return his bathing towel may serve as good illustrations of this type of humour.

As instances of the last two types of humour noted

above may be pointed out the exchange of questions and answers between Maitreya on the one hand and Śakāra[71] or Kumbhīlaka[72] on the other; or Śakāra on the one hand with Viṭa[73], or Bhikṣu[74], or Ceṭa[75] on the other; or between Cārudatta and Śarvilaka[76].

It may thus be readily admitted that Śūdraka is a master of humour in all its varieties and aspects and that our play affords a unique instance of a drama very fervently pervaded by humour of every type.

According to Sanskrit writers on dramaturgy a play has five stages (or संधिs) significantly called मुख, प्रतिमुख, गर्भ, विमर्श and निर्वहण respectively.[76a] In the मृच्छकटिक, Act I forms the मुख, the प्रतिमुख extends over Act II to IV, the next Act forms the गर्भ, Acts VI—IX constitute the विमर्श while the last संधि is formed by the last Act.

We may now conclude this chapter by a few remarks on Śūdraka's poetical qualities and style. Śūdraka has used several metres including long ones like Sragdharā snd Śārdūlavikrīḍita with good ease and grace. His diction is simple and is strewn with similes, metaphors, and other figures of speech put fittingly in the mouth of the various dramatis personæ. His language on the whole is simple, though sometimes he has shown that he can rise to the dignity of the *gauḍī* style in consonance with the subject matter. He has varied his style according to sentiments. Ryder appreciates Śūdraka's lyrical bent and charms of style and adds that it suggests the question whether we might not more justly speak the Sanskrit plays as dramatic poems than as dramas. It must, however, be remembered that Sanskrit writers do look upon drama as a kāvya—of course dṛśya kāvya, and are more anxious about the

maitenance and development of sentiments than about anything else. Sanskrit plays are, therefore, poems in that respect. But we must not lose sight of the fact that these plays are dṛśya kāvyas i. e. meant to be exhibited on the stage. Nor have Sanskrit playwrights lost sight of this fact as we have amply seen in the case of the Mṛcchakaṭika here. If then by dramatic poems is meant drama not fit for the stage, we must differ from Ryder and say that Sanskrit plays are dramas with poetic charms and qualities added to them.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIETY AS DEPICTED IN THE MṚCCHAKAṬIKA

In a work of art it is often interesting to see the reflection of the contemporary society in its various aspects. Śūdraka, like a good dramatist has in his Mṛcchakaṭika held the mirror up to nature and given us a good picture of the social, religious and to some extent political conditions of his day.

Caste system was well established and the three castes were looked upon as being superior to the last one along with the other sub-castes[1]. The Brāhmaṇas had special privileges. They were held in high esteem by all and were on several occasions served with food and given good *dakṣiṇā*. Some Brāhmaṇas were very rich or enjoyed a rich patronage and refused to dine with or receive gifts from others. The poor ones, however, accepted such invitations and dined with even low caste people and courtesans. Even *dharmaśāstras*[2] exempted Brāhmaṇas from capital punishment and the highest penalty for a Brāhmaṇa was merely expulsion with all his belongings intact. There was, however, a section[3] among the Brāhmaṇas who did not dine at others or accept *dakṣiṇā*. The Brāhmaṇas were most of them well-versed in the Vedic lores, sometimes in all the four Vedas, and were sometimes employed by the rich people to worship idols in their house or to recite *mantras* or perform some religious duties.

But we have in the Mṛcchakaṭika instances of Brāhmaṇas taking to different professions. Thus Cārudatta–

even his father and grand-father—was a merchant ; Śarvilaka has become a robber and has married a courtesan's maid. Caste system, therefore, does not appear to have been very rigid. Other castes are also referred to. But caste does not seem to determine a man's profession. Nor does it form a bar against higher posts in government service as is shown by the fact that even a cobbler and a barber[4] could rise to be a police officer, and even an ordinary cow-boy[5] could become a king. As a general rule, however, persons must have followed their hereditary professions just as is done by the caṇḍālas. Untouchability also seems to be absent and there existed at least some wells[6] which were open to even the lowest caste along with the best of the Brāhmaṇas. Even in the last act we get no reference to untouchability as we have it in the Mudrā-Rākṣasa[7].

The Vaṇiks carried on trade with foreign lands and often went there leaving aside their loving relations.[8] They amassed vast wealth by selling different commodities and spent their money sometimes in personal enjoyment, or sometimes in works of public utility[9] or sometimes in helping others and appreciating their good deeds. Trade with foreign lands was sometimes carried on in big vessels[10]. The vaṇik was, however, an object of general distrust as is shown by a remark of Maitreya.[11]

The *suvarṇakāra* and the *kāyastha* do not as yet seem to have attained the position of separate castes : and yet we come across the belief that there is no *suvarṇakāra* who is not a *caura*[11] and find Cārudatta describing a *kāyastha* as a serpent of the court[12].

There were two classes of women viz. *prakāśanārī* (or *gaṇikā*) and *aprakāśanārī* (or *vadhū* or *kulavadhū*).

The former often amassed vast wealth and were so rich as to own palatial mansions with varied riches and have even elephants.[13] They, as a general rule, loved the riches of a man than the man himself whom they deserted as soon as they had screwed out all his wealth from him.[14] They formed a very great temptation and vice for man, so much so that a man once addicted to a courtesan could hardly get rid of her[15]. They went out to any one who offered them great wealth in any form and even went out to public gardens to sport with such men. They were looked upon as the common property or a commodity that could be purchased by any one at will.[16] Inspite of such vast wealth, however, their social status was far inferior to that of the *kulavadhū* so much so that neither they nor any thing belonging to them had any access to the interior of the house of a gentleman.[17] Very often they were subjected to force and molestation and ran the danger of being pursued by undesirable persons. They were, of course, well-versed in several arts.[18] particularly music, dancing &c., and acquired boldness owing to their contact with several men.[19] Some courtesans were, however, too good for the profession and refused to be attracted by wealth. They cared more for qualities[20] than for money and boldly stuck to their resolve inspite of an opposing mother[21]. A *prakāśa* woman could attain the status of a *kulavadhū* by getting married[22] and such a *kulavadhū* was considered to be superior in status even to her former mistress.[23] Sometimes the king bestowed the title of a *kulavadhū* on a *prakāśa* woman in appreciation of her good qualities[24] and then she could become a lawful wife of the man of her choice.

The woman of the other type was more mild and

restrained by nature. Her place was in the harem or the inner apartment of the house and if and when she moved out—of course on rare occasions—she put on a veil. She seems to have been dependent upon her husband in money matters[25], though she had her own *strīdhana*[26] which she could dispose of any way she liked. As wife she looks upon her hushand as her most important ornament[27], and as such did not care much for any other ornaments. She was no doubt concerned with the physical safety and happiness of her husbsnd ; but still more was she concerned with his *cāritra*,[28] to save which she would not hesitate to part with all her belongings. She would die rather than hear any inauspicious news about her husband.[29] Though a loving mother she would not care for the entreaties even of her son[30] and would immolate herself (even against the dictum of the sages) when her husband's life is in danger. She was, unlike the *prakāśanārī*, a true and constant companion of her husband in all the vissicitudes of fortune and was as such a real treasure to him.[31] It is no wonder then that some *prakāśanārīs* hankered after the status of a *vadhū* and were ready to sacrifice anything for attaining it. For it was, indeed, *durlabha*[32] to them.

We must also note a third class of women known as *bhujisyā* (female slave). Such women were totally dependent on their masters or mistresses whom they served. Their status naturally was very low. But they were very kindly treated, almost like family members and could buy their freedom by paying a ransom to their master or mistress.[33] Even these women were not debarred from getting married after being duly ransomed, and thus attaining the position of a ***kulavadhū***.

A woman was well respected on the whole and it was considered wrong to try to outrage the modesty of a woman of any class; and yet there seem to have been some nasty notions current about low women in particular[34]. These were, however, generally entertained by the disappointed few and need not be taken very seriously.

There seem to have been no caste restrictions in marriage and a Brāhmaṇa could marry even a courtesan or even her slave. There appear, however, no instances in the Mṛcchakaṭika of what is known as the *pratiloma vivāha*. Wives were generally faithful to their husbands though the wives of weaklings sometimes ran the danger of being kidnapped.[35]

Great importance was attached to friendship and a friend in danger or in the hour of his need was considered worth more than a hundred wives.[36] Thus we see Śarvilaka hastening for the rescue of his friend leaving aside his newly wedded bride. For a friend one was willing to undergo any risk or trouble; and if that could be allowed one would even give one's life to save that of a friend.[37] Sometimes to avoid the pangs of separation from a friend one would even commit suicide, often by burning one-self. This *anumaraṇa* was sanctioned by sages in the case of women but it was considered a sin to ascend a funeral pyre without the (dead body of the) husband there.[38] Though Bāṇa in the seventh century wrote in denunciation of this practice[39] our play does not contain even the slightest suggestion to that effect.

Of the social evils we may first notice gambling which in the Mṛcchakaṭika seems to have been in a highly developed condition. There was a gamblers' associa-

tion,[40] which had a strong and firm hold on each and every gambler. The *sabhika*, as the gambling officer was called, was in charge of the gambling stand or station and had full authority to recover the dues from a defaulter. He could not only pursue and catch him but even press him to get himself sold or even strike him. There were, however, some gamblers who defied his authority and even quarrelled with him. More often than not, however, the gambler's lot was far from being enviable. He was subjected to various hardships[41] such as being bitten by dogs or being suspended head downwards all day long. If sometimes gambling brought all pleasures to the gambler, it often cost him all but life.[42] It was, however, the worst of temptations and made the gambler insensible to defeat and derision and losses.[43] But it was not considered as a vice. Any person could indulge in gambling as long as he or she could afford it. Neither Cārudatta nor Vasantasenā thought it below their dignity to declare that they lost the ornaments in gambling. Even a losing gambler would be very cordially invited for another game by the *sabhika* and the other gamblers who might have persecuted him a minute before for their dues.[44] It was only in rare cases as in the case of Saṁvāhaka that a gambler repented and turned a monk.[45] As a general rule, however, a gambler going from bad to worse became more and more confirmed in his addiction.[46]

Next to note is robbery which appears as a science in the Mṛcchakaṭika with a deity[47] and a tradition of its own. Measuring tape, magical seeds for finding out hidden treasure, an effigy to be let into a house before actually entering it, several utensils for house-breaking and weapons for self-defence—all these have been directly

or indirectly referred to in the Mṛcchakaṭika. Various details also are given as regards house-breaking[48] and such other matters. Robbery was resorted to even by persons of the highest caste and mainly for acquiring money. Even robbers, it seems, had a code of honour of their own; and killing a woman, or striking at a frightened or a sleeping person, stealing away a Brāhmaṇa's belongings or sacrificial money; or kidnapping a child were scrupulously avoided.[49] Thefts were generally committed during the dark hours of the night[50] and thieves had to acquire several qualities before they took to their profession.[51]

Slavery is another social evil reflected in the Mṛcchakaṭika. Slaves, both male as well as female, were completely at the mercy of their masters or mistresses; and could be bought and sold or ransomed. Sometimes they[52] were set free by their masters even without any ransom. As a general rule their word had little value and as against their master's statement, the slaves' statement, that of even the most honest and sincere one, would be dubbed down as a lie. They were, however, devoted to their masters, though even for them they would not commit anything immoral.[54]

Poverty is yet another evil which is the root of almost all evils.[55] There was a section of society that believed in the adage '*All virtues resort to gold*', and hence also that the poor were always full of all vices. The poor had to labour under various handicaps and social disabilities at home and abroad and ever ran the danger of being charged with crimes committed by others. Fortunately, however, society was not wanting in persons who cared more for qualities than for wealth of men.

Institution of courtesans is also looked upon as a social evil. A courtesan formed a vice that cannot be easily checked. A gentleman could have connection with a courtesan and yet could declare that it had nothing to do with his character.[56] But it was also recognised that a courtesan that has once entered a house would be ousted with only great difficulty ; and very often courtesans spurned a man when his wealth was all exhausted.

Hinduism in the Mṛcchakaṭika appears to comprise not only sacrifices and worship of deities or idols but also offerings (*bali* and *upahāra*) to different deities or spirits at the thresholds of houses or on the cross roads. Several *vratas* were observed with fasts and Brāhmaṇas were invited for dinner and *dakṣinā* was paid to them. These were observed with various aims or objects in view very often suggested by the names by which they were known. Rich persons often got public gardens and tanks erected as religious deeds for acquiring religious merit. The Brāhmaṇas performed their *sandhyā* adoration, daily worship and also meditation as their daily obligatory duties with full belief that deities will surely be propitiated thereby.[57] Doubting Thomases like Maitreya were not, however, wanting. Of the *āśramas* (or the four stages of life) only two are referred to. The *gṛhastha* has some obligatory duties and rites which he has to perform under all circumstances with unflinching faith ; while the *saṁnyāsa* seems to have degenerated owing to some unworthy persons embracing it.[58]

The *doctrine of karman* seems to have a strong hold on the society. It was believed that our condition in the present birth is the fruit of our actions in the previous birth (or births).[59] But it must be noted that this belief

is far from resulting in a despondent and pessimistic attitude towards worldly life or the life of actuality. On the contrary it has proved a veritable source of strength and a solid bed-rock for a highly keen sense of morality and uprightness. Not only men like Cārudatta but also slaves like Sthāvaraka and ordinary men like the Viṭa firmly refused to commit any thing wrong, to avoid distress and difficulties in the future birth at least if it is not possible to do so in this very birth. They felt extremely sorry if even unwittingly they have been responsible for some wrong and tried to set the matter right as far as it was in their power to do so.[60] In their words as well as deeds people appear to have been more honest and god-fearing than otherwise, though there are a few instances to the contrary also.

Buddhism seems to have been in a somewhat flourishing condition, and any one irrespective of caste or age or even social standing could be a monk at his will. Women also could take to a mendicant's life and become nuns.[61] The monks and nuns renounced all mundane life and were like *saṁnyāsins* in their paraphernalia and external appearance.[62] There were big monasteries (called *vihāra*) where the monks and the nuns dwelt. Every city and town had its *vihāras* in the land. Apparently the king had good control over these monasteries and the head monk in charge of them was appointed by the king's order.[63] The monks (and presumably the nuns also) recited the *dharmākṣaras*[64] every day and hoped to attain *svarga* thereby. They appear on the whole to be well behaved and attach great importance to control over sense organs more than any thing else.[65] Very simple in their apparel and other equipments they were very lofty in their thoughts and possess-

ed a strict moral rectitude, if we are to judge by the example of the representative of this class we have in the Mṛcchakaṭika. Inspite of the apparently flourishing condition and royal patronage of Buddhism, the sight of a Buddhistic monk was loked upon as being inauspicious and an ill omen.[65]

The king appears to have been the supreme head of the state and had full control over all his subjects so that he could pass any orders and get them obeyed. At any rate he was the final authority to pass a sentence in a case after it had been duly conducted and reported to him by the judge.[66] He was very often led away by his minister's counsels[67] and sometimes acted under the influence of his favourites and relatives (particularly through the zenana). More often than not these relatives also got several things done by others merely under threat on the strength of their royal connection.[68]

A special officer was in charge of law. He tried cases and suits and after full investigation reported the full details to the king with his own recommendation at least in some cases; and it was on the strength of these that the king passed the final judgment. The judge was helped by two officers called *śreṣṭhin* and *kāyastha* serving as assessors and court-scribe respectively. Any one could go to the court and lodge a complaint or file a suit in person and there was a servant who served the purpose of a modern bailiffe summoning people to the court whenever required. The judge was expected to be highly competent and impartial.[69] His lot, however, was far from being enviable, for he would soon be blamed than appreciated by the public.[70] The appointment (and hence the dismissal also) was in the hands of the king,[71] and hence sometimes he had to play to the

humour of the king and his favourites. At least he had to be very cautious while dealing with royal favourites.

Trial seems to have been very speedy, though attempt was made to sift all sorts of evidence from all possible sources. When direct evidence was insufficient, indirect or circumstantial evidence was utilised in deciding matters. The culprit then had to make an open confession of his guilt on pain of being whipped[72] if necessary. If the evidence was all inconclusive either way recourse was had to trial by ordeal[73] in any one of its four varieties. But if the judge thought that the evidence before him was sufficient to decide the matter he did not resort to ordeal and reported the case directly to the king for final disposal.

The police department seems to have been working with great zeal and efficiency, though there were some officers who were more soft-hearted than their comrades. There were night watches[74] on streets, though apparently they did not hinder the pursuit of a lady like Vasantasenā on open street by persons like Śakāra. On certain occasions every cart was inspected though even here some soft-hearted police officer would let a cart go uninspected, paricularly if it belonged to some great man.[75] Scuffles could also take place on the streets and there would be no police to look into the matter. This, however, happened by day. The police officers were drawn from any caste or class and had weaknesses of their own.

Punishments were very strict and harsh.[76] Even on mere suspicion persons were thrown into dark dungeons corresponding to the modern eoncentration camps. We see how the poor Saṁvāhaka is harassed by Sabhika and have also a glowing description of the punishments

meeted out to a defaulting gambler.[77] Śedition was, of course, punished with instantaneous death. Brāhmaṇas seem to be generally exempted from capital punishment, though even this rule was not without an exception. The culprit sentenced to death[78] was imprinted with red finger marks, decked with garland of red flowers and had to carry the spike (on which he was to hang) on his shoulder and the article of offence on his person. He was thus carried through the streets in procession and was at every stand on the road made to declare his crime with his own lips. The executioners, though kind at heart, did their work with deft hand.[79] There were certain circumstances[80] like ransoming, or birth of prince, or revolution which caused the release of all culprits.

Revolution appears so have been not a very difficult matter. The dissatisfied and the distressed persons[80] of the society generally rallied round a prospective leader and a change of rule could be effected simply by assassinating the reigning monarch and declaring the leader as king in his place. The ruling king would of course try with all his might to check all such persons, but had little hopes of success so long as he could not win the respect and sympathy of his subjects by his benevolent rule.

We shall now bring this chapter to a close by observing a few popular notions and beliefs noticed in the Mṛcchakaṭika and passing a few remarks on the general standard of morality obtaining in those days. Belief in omens good and bad was quite common. Even persons like Cārudatta and Vasantasenā had strong belief in them and were often dismayed when faced with some evil

omens in particular. Thus we see Cārudatta meeting with several incidents forboding ill as he is on his way to the law-court. Such for example are the shrill crowing of a crow, throbbing of the left eye, a serpent on the way, stumbling on even ground, and dashing the head against something.[81] To the same category again belongs the falling of a huge tree all of a sudden,[82] or throbbing of the right eye[83] in the case of a woman, or the sight of a Buddhistic monk. Astrology also was fairly popular; and it was believed that positions and conjunctions of stars in the firmament had good or bad influence on the life of human beings on the earth below.[84] Belief in the doctrine of karman and that in the efficacy of daily worship of and offerings to various deities have been already referred to above. The general standard of morality, however, is very high. For it is not only great persons like Cārudatta and Vasantasenā, but even low class persons like Sthāvaraka that show a moral rectitude, though persons like Śakāra, a complete moral wreck, and also persons like Maitreya, intensely practical persons, are not wanting.

NOTES

[References are to Prin. Karmarkar's edition]

CHAPTER I

1. द्विरदेन्द्रगतिश्चकोरनेत्रः परिपूर्णेन्दुमुखः सुविग्रहश्च।
द्विजमुख्यतमः कविर्बभूव प्रथितः शूद्रक इत्यगाधसत्वः ॥
ऋग्वेदं सामवेदं गणितमथ कलां वैशिकीं हस्तिशिक्षां
ज्ञात्वा शर्वप्रसादाद्व्यपगततिमिरे चक्षुषी चोपलभ्य।
राजानं वीक्ष्य पुत्रं परमसमुदयेनाश्वमेधेन चेष्ट्वा
लब्ध्वा चायुःशताब्दं दशदिनसहितं शूद्रकोऽग्निं प्रविष्टः ॥
समरव्यसनी प्रमादशून्यः ककुदं वेदविदां तपोधनश्च।
परवारणबाहुयुद्धलुब्धः क्षितिपालः किल शूद्रको बभूव ॥ I. 3-5.

2. See Chapter III, p. 40.

3. Sk. Drama, p. 30.

4. ibid, p. 30.

5. cf. Nerurkar, Intoduction to his edition of the मृच्छकटिक, pp. 15-19.

6. लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः।
असत्पुरुषसेवेव दृष्टिर्विफलतां गता ॥ I. 34

which is also found in the चारुदत्त and also the बालचरित.

7. cf. New Indian Antiquary Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 76–85.

8. cf. ibid p. 82f.

9. cf. भगवति सह्यवासिनि प्रसीद प्रसीद। X. 37–2.

10. cf. वयं दाक्षिणात्या अव्यक्तभाषिणः। p. 194.

11. cf. खश–खत्ति–खड–खडट्ठ–विड–कर्णाट–कर्ण–प्रावरण–द्राविड–चोल–चीन–बर्बर–खेर–खान–मुख–मधुघातप्रभृतीनां म्लेच्छजातीनां etc. p. 194.

12. See Kale, Introduction p. xviii ff.

13. cf. Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference, pp. 193-201.

14. cf. तौ शूद्रककथाकारौ रम्यौ रामिलसौमिलौ ।
काव्यं ययोर्द्वयोरासीदर्धनारीनरोपमम् ॥

15. e. g. दशकुमारचरित, कादम्बरी, हर्षचरित, राजतरङ्गिणी and वेतालपञ्चविंशति. There are three more works viz विक्रान्तशूद्रक, शूद्रकवध and शूद्रकचरित which are known to us from only references made to them elsewhere. Also read Dr.Pusalkar's article in the J. A. H. R. S. Vol. XI. pp. 33-42. Dr. B. A. Saletore in Bombay Uni. Journal, Vol. XVI (New series) parts 1 and 4 has propounded double authorship of the play. The first part is according to him composed by Śivamāra I of the ancient Gānga Royal dynasty (675-725 A. D.) while the second by Śivamāra II of the same dynasty in the last quarter of the 8th century A. D.

16. cf. Sukhthankar Memorial Edition, Vol. II, p. 124.

17. यासां बलिः सपदि etc. I. 9 ; and द्यूतं हि नाम पुरुषस्यासिंहासनं राज्यम् । p. 59 are quoted by वामन at का० सूत्रवृत्ति V. 1.3 and IV. 3-23 respectively.

18. मृ० I. 8 and 14 = पंच० II. 34 and 40; and मृ० IX. 26d = पंच० V. 94d.

19. cf. Devasthali, 'Introduction to the Study of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa' pp. 12 and 144.

20. For these see Paranjpe, Introduction, p. xxviii

21. This is discussed on p. 101 f. below.

22. For these cf. New Indian Antiquary, Vol. II, No. 2 pp. 76-85.

23. }
24. } See Chapter V pp. 100 f.

25. cf. IX. 53.

26. cf. विषसलिलतुलाग्निप्रार्थिते मे विचारे etc. IX. 43.

27. cf. आर्य चारुदत्त निर्णये वयं प्रमाणं शेषे तु राजा । p. 289

28. cf. Tagore Law Lectures (1883), p. 68 ff.

29. cf. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. 1, pp. 205 and 210.

30. For this read Chapter VII, p. 141.

31. cf. Introduction, p. xxiii (f).

32. cf. Paranjpe, Introduction, p. xxvii (j).

33. This is discussed in chapter VI, on p. 128.

33a. I am indebted to my friend Dr. A. N. Upadhye for this explanation. For other instances of this kind read Dr. Upadhye's article in Siddha-Bhāratī, Vol. I, pp. 265-266.

34. The definition of an अङ्क (cf. प्रत्यक्षनेतृचारित.) requires the hero's presence on the stage in each and every act. In our play, however, चा० does not appear on the stage in Acts II, IV, VI, and VIII.

35. Like the मालतीमाधव, for example.

36. See Devasthali, 'Introduction to the Study of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa', p. 117 and n. 8 on p. 163.

37. cf. मालवि० (Karmarkar's ed.) pp. 12 and 113; शाकुन्तल (Gajendragadkar's ed.) pp. 44, 47 and 159; विक्रमो० (Athalye and Bhave ed.) p. 72.

38. For प्राकृतs in the मृच्छकटिक cf. Keith, Sk. Drama, p. 140-142.

39. cf. X. 46.

40. cf. वयस्य मा मैवम् । गृहस्थस्य नित्योऽयं विधिः ।
तपसा मनसा वाग्भिः पूजिता बलिकर्मभिः ।
तुष्यन्ति शमिनां नित्यं देवताः किं विचारितैः I. 16.

41. cf. De and Dasgupta, History of Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I. p. 249 n. 1.

CHAPTER III

1. तथाप्यवश्यं कर्तव्या नान्दी विघ्नोपशान्तये ।
पदैर्युक्ता द्वादशभिरष्टाभिर्वा पदैरुत ॥ सा० द० VI 23 & 25.

2. cf. आशीर्वचनसंयुक्तः श्लोकः काव्यार्थसूचकः ।
नान्दीति कथ्यते प्राज्ञैः ....॥

3. नटी विदूषको वापि पारिपार्श्वक एव वा ।
सूत्रधारेण सहिताः संलापं यत्र कुर्वते ॥
चित्रैर्वाक्यैः स्वकार्योत्थैः प्रस्तुताक्षेपिभिर्मिथः ।
आमुखं तत्तु विज्ञेयं नाम्ना प्रस्तावनापि सा ॥ सा० द० VI. 30 f

4. उद्धात्यकः कथोद्धातः प्रयोगातिशयस्तथा ।
प्रवृत्तकावलगिते पञ्च प्रस्तावनाभिदाः ॥ सा० द० VI. 33.

5. cf. Paranjpe, Notes p. 7 f.

6. cf. एषोऽस्मि कार्यवशात् प्रयोगवशाच्च आयोध्यिकस्तदानींतनश्च संवृत्तः ।

7. कालं प्रवृत्तमाश्रित्य सूत्रधृग्यत्र वर्णयेत् ।
तदाश्रयश्च पात्रस्य प्रवेशस्तत्प्रवृत्तकम् ॥ सा० द० VI. 37.

8. एषोऽयमित्युपक्षेपात् सूत्रधारप्रयोगतः ।
पात्रप्रवेशो यत्रैष प्रयोगातिशयो मतः ॥ द० रू० III. 11.

9. cf. कदा नु खलु त्वां कुपितेन राज्ञा पालकेन नववधूकेशहस्तमिव ससुगन्धं छेद्यमानं प्रेक्षिष्ये । p. 7.

10. This point is discussed in chapter VI on p. 127 f.

11. I. 16.

12. अन्यच्च एतस्यां प्रदोषवेलायामिह राजमार्गे गणिका विटाश्चेटा राजवल्लभाश्च पुरुषाः संचरन्ति । etc. p. 15.

13. cf. अपावृतपक्षद्वारेण पिण्डीभूतेन वातेन निर्वापितः प्रदीपः । p.28.

14. It may be noted that having noticed the scent

here, Vasantasenā is able to recognize the garment later on in Act II on the strength of this scent.

15. कथितं च मम प्रियवयस्येन शर्विलकेन यथा किल आर्यकनामा गोपालदारकः सिद्धादेशेन समादिष्टो राजा भविष्यति इति। सर्वश्चास्मद्विधो जनस्तमनुसरति। तदहमपि तत्स मीपमेव गच्छामि। (p. 65)

16. An indirect reference to Pālaka's high-handedness occurs in the prologue. cf. p. 7.

17. एतत् कस्याप्यनपावृतपक्षद्वारकं गेहम्। तदत्र प्रविशामि। p. 65.

18. तत् संवाहको द्यूतकरः शाक्यश्रमणकः संवृत्त इति स्मर्तव्यान्यार्ययैतान्यक्षराणि। p. 74.

19. मम तावद् द्वाभ्यामेव हास्यं जायते। स्त्रिया संस्कृतं पठन्त्या मनुष्येण च काकलीं गायता। etc. p. 81f.

20. अद्याप्येततिष्ठति। किमत्रोज्जयिन्यां चौरोऽपि नास्ति य एतं दास्याःपुत्रं निद्राचौरं नापहरति। p. 35.

21. read Maitreya's remarks on p. 97 and 98.

22. read Śarvilaka's speech on p. 93f.

23. III. 23.

24. वयस्य दिष्ट्या ते प्रियं निवेदयामि। and यदसौ कृतार्थो गतः। p. 98.

25. cf. कथं न्यासः। (मोहमुपगतः) p. 98.

26. cf. यदि न्यासश्चौरेणापहृतस्त्वं किं मोहमुपगतः। (p. 98) and अहं खल्वपलपिष्यामि केन दत्तं केन गृहीतं को वा साक्षी इति। p. 99

27. cf. III 26.

28. For discussion regarding Cārudatta as hero see Chapter IV, pp. 88–90.

29. cf. वरमिदानीं स शरीरेण परिक्षतः न पुनश्चारित्रेण। p. 100.

30. cf. मा तावदखादितस्याभुक्तस्याल्पमूल्यस्य चौरैरपहृतस्य कारणात् चतुःसमुद्रसारभूता रत्नावली दीयते। p. 103.

31. cf. III. 29.

32. cf. III. 26.

33. cf. अपेहि मा पुनरेवं भणिष्यसि। and एवं विज्ञापयितव्या यदि मां जीवन्तीमिच्छसि तदेवं न पुनरहं मांत्राज्ञापयितव्या। p. 107.

34. cf. IV. 31; also. cf. IV. 6 and मदनिके भीते सुप्ते न शर्विलकः प्रहरति। p. 114.

35. न चन्द्रादातपो भवति। p. 118.

36. साधु मदनिके साधु। अभुजिष्ययेव मन्त्रितम्। p. 119.

37. IV 9-17.

38. cf. सम्प्रति तु सुन्दरीणां शतादपि सुहृद्विशिष्टतमः। IV 25 cd.

39. cf. IV. 26.

40. cf IV. 28.

41. cf. कियत्तपश्चरणं कृत्वा वसन्तसेनाया भ्राता भवति। and the following verse i. e. IV. 29.

42. cf. अहो अस्या कपर्दडाकिन्या उदरविस्तारः। तत्किमेतां प्रवेश्य महादेवमिव द्वारशोभा इह गृहे निर्मिता। (P. 135); and also भगवंश्चातुर्थिक एतेनोपकारेण मामपि ब्राह्मणमवलोकय। p. 136. and also IV 50.

43. उदयन्तु नाम मेघा भवतु निशा वर्षमविरतं पततु। गणयामि नैव सर्वं दयिताभिमुखेन हृदयेन॥ IV. 33. Also cf. with this V. 31.

44. V. 46.

45. V. 1, 4, 6.

46. cf. यथैष ऊर्ध्वं प्रेक्ष्य दीर्घं निःश्वसिति तथा तर्कयामि मया विनिवार्यमाणस्याधिकतरं वर्धितास्योत्कण्ठा। etc. p. 148.

47. तत्तर्कयामि रत्नावल्या अपरितुष्टा अपरं याचितुमागमिष्यतीति। p. 148.

48. वयस्य आगच्छतु। परितुष्टा यास्यति। p. 148.

49. See 46 and 47 above.

50. Note that while st. 15 refers to निशा and st. 17 refers to the moon, st. 20 speaks of the sun being swallowed by the dark clouds which in the same verse again are said to have kidnapped ज्योत्स्ना. St. 25 again speaks of the disappearing of तारा ; while a rain-bow is referred to in st. 26 and also in st. 51.

51. cf. V. 40-42.

52. cf. V 43.

53. cf. V 46..

54. cf. दास्याःपुत्र दुर्दिन अनार्य इदानीमसि त्वं यदत्रभवतीं विद्युता भीषयसि। p. 171.

55. cf. V. 48-49.

56. cf. आर्ये भणत्यार्या धूता—आर्यपुत्रेण युष्माकं प्रसादीकृता। न युक्तं ममैतां ग्रहीतुम्। आर्यपुत्र एव ममाभरणविशेष इति जानातु भवती। p. 176.

57. रदनिके अलीकं त्वं भणसि। यद्यस्माकमार्या जननी तत् किमर्थमलङ्कृता। p. 179.

58. (नाट्येनाभरणान्यवतार्य रुदती) एषेदानीं ते जननी संवृत्ता। तद्गृहाणैतमलङ्कारम्। सौवर्णशकटिकां कारय। p. 179.

59. ही ही भो: मयापि यानास्तरणं विस्मृतम्। तद्यावद् गृहीत्वागच्छामि। एतौ नासारज्जुकटुकौ बलीवर्दौ। भवतु। प्रवहणेनैव गतागतिं करिष्यामि। p. 180.

60. भारवत् प्रवहणम्। अथवा चक्रपरिवर्तनेन परिश्रान्तस्य भारवत् प्रवहणं प्रतिभासते। p. 183.

61. कथं नूपुरशब्दः। तदागता खल्वार्या। आर्ये इमौ नासारज्जुकटुकौ बलीवर्दौ। तत्पृष्ठत एवारोहत्वार्या। p. 185.

62. पादोत्फालचालितानां नूपुराणां विश्रान्तः शब्दः। भाराक्रान्तं च प्रवहणम्। तथा तर्कयामि सांप्रतमार्ययारूढया भवितव्यम्। p. 186.

63. कथमेषोऽपरः सभिकमिव मां प्रेक्ष्य सहसैव द्रुतपलायित इव

द्यूतकरोऽपवार्यात्मानमन्यतोऽपक्रान्तः। तत्कः पुनरेषः। अथवा किं ममैतेन। त्वरितं गमिष्यामि। p. 181.

64. इदं कस्यापि साधोरनपावृतपक्षद्वारकं गेहम्। and the stanza that follows. VI. 3.

65. VI. 20.

66. आर्यगोपालदारक आर्यचारुदत्तस्य प्रवहणमधिरुह्यापक्रामतीति यदि कथ्यते तदार्यचारुदत्तो राज्ञा शास्यते। तत्कोऽत्र उपायः। (विचिन्त्य) कर्णाटकलहप्रयोगं करोमि। p. 195.

67. VII. 8.

68. नीरसोऽनुचितस्तत्र संसूच्यो वस्तुविस्तरः।
अर्थोपक्षेपकैः सूच्यं पंचभिः प्रतिपादयेत्।
विष्कम्भचूलिकाङ्कास्याङ्कावतारप्रवेशकैः॥ द० रू० I. 57.

69. प्रकरणविषये पंचाद्या दशपरास्तथा चैव।
अङ्काः कर्तव्याः स्युर्नानारसभावसंयुक्ताः॥ ना० शा० 18–28

70. cf. विपर्यस्तमनश्चेष्टैः शिलाशकलवर्ष्मभिः।
मांसवृक्षैरियं मूर्खैर्भाराक्रान्ता वसुन्धरा॥ VIII. 6.

71. cf. यद्यप्यहमेवं भणामि तथापि तवैष आचारः अधिरोहतु भट्टारकः इति भणितुम्। p. 221.

72. cf. भाव भाव मृतोऽसि। प्रवहणाधिरूढा राक्षसी चौरो वा प्रतिवसति। तद्यदि राक्षसी तदोभावपि मुषितौ। अथ चौरः तदोभावपि खादितौ। p. 222.

73. cf. भाव प्रवहणाधिरूढा स्त्री प्रतिवसति। तदवलोकय। p. 222. Also read कथं शगाला उड्डीयन्ते वायसा व्रजन्ति। तद्यावद् भावोऽक्षिभ्यां भक्ष्यते दन्तैः प्रेक्ष्यते तावदहं पलायिष्ये। p. 223.

74. cf. प्रवहणविपर्यासेनागता। शरणागतास्मि। p. 224.

75. Read शकार's speech on p. 225.

76. अपेहि अनार्य मन्त्रयसे। (इति पादेन ताडयति) p. 226.

77. cf. कथं मम नयनयोरायासकरः स एव राजश्यालः। तत् संशयितास्मि मन्दभाग्या। एतदिदानीं मम मन्दभागिन्या ऊषरक्षेत्रपतित इव बीजमुष्टिर्निष्फलमिहागमनं संवृत्तम्। तत् किमत्र करिष्यामि। p. 223.

78. cf. pp. 228 ff.

79. cf. भाव एषा तवाग्रतो लज्जते न मामङ्गीकरोति। तद्गच्छ। स्थावरकचेटो मया ताडितो गतोऽपि। एष प्रपलाय्य गच्छति। तस्मात्तं गृहीत्वागच्छतु भावः। p. 235.

80. cf. एवं मम हस्ते एषा न्यासेन (Pk. णाशेण which may also be नाशेन) तिष्ठतु। p. 236.

81a. cf. भवतु मारयिष्यामि। अथवा कपटकापटिक एष ब्राह्मणो वृद्धशृगालः कदाचिद्रूपवारितशरीरो गत्वा शृगालो भूत्वा कपटं करोति। तदेतस्य वञ्चनानिमित्तमेवं तावत् करिष्यामि। p. 236.

81. cf. VIII. 32–33; सहकारपादपं सेवित्वा न पलाशपादपमङ्गीकरिष्यामि। (p. 237); हृदयगत एव किमिति न स्मर्यते।; भण भण पुनरपि भण श्लाघनीयान्येतान्यक्षराणि।; परित्रायते यदि मां प्रेक्षते। (p. 238); and lastly नम आर्यचारुदत्ताय (p. 239 & 240).

82. cf. VIII. 36–37.

83. अनिमित्तमेतत्। यत्सत्यं वसन्तसेनां प्रति शङ्कितं मे मनः। p.241.

84. cf. गतोऽस्मि तत्र। दृष्टं च मया स्त्रीकलेवरं श्वापदैर्विलुप्यमानम्। p. 277. This evidence supplied by वीरक turns the scales against चारुदत्त.

85. cf. VIII. 40.

86. cf. मदीये पुष्पकरण्डकजीर्णोद्याने वसन्तसेनां मारयित्वा कुत्र पलायसे। एहि ममावुत्तस्याग्रतो व्यवहारं देहि। p. 246.

87. Read his long speech on pp. 247–249.

88. cf. IX. 3–5.

89. संक्षेपादपवाद एव सुलभो द्रष्टुर्गुणो दूरतः। IX. 4 & 5 d.

90. cf. कथम्। प्रथममेव राष्ट्रियश्यालः कार्यार्थी। यथा सूर्योदय उपरागो महापुरुषनिपातमेव कथयति। p. 258, also cf. IX. 7.

91. cf. चारुदत्तो मित्रमिति नास्ति दोषः। or कथम्। आर्यचारुदत्तोऽप्यस्माभिराह्वाययितव्यः। अथवा व्यवहारस्तमाह्वयति। भद्र शोधनक गच्छ। आर्यचारुदत्तं स्वैरमसंभ्रान्तमनुद्विग्नं सादरमाहूय प्रस्तावेन—अधिकरणिकस्त्वां द्रष्टुमिच्छति इति। or IX. 16, 20, 21, 22, etc.

92. cf. सर्वमस्य मूर्खस्य संभाव्यते। भद्र उच्यताम्—आगच्छ दृश्यते तव व्यवहार: । p. 259.

93. cf. IX. 8–9.

94. cf. IX. 10–13 and 15.

95. IX. 14.

96. अथवा यौवनमत्रापराध्यति न चारित्रम्। p. 271.

97. cf. गृहं गता । किमन्यद् ब्रवीमि । p. 273.

98. cf. किं प्रच्छन्नं गतेति ब्रवीमि । p. 273.

99. cf. IX. 20–22.

100. हताश यस्तदानीं न्यासीकृतं सुवर्णभाण्डं चौरैरपहृतमिति तस्य कारणाच्चतु:समुद्रसारभूतां रत्नावलीं ददाति स इदानीमर्थकल्यवर्तस्य कारणादिदमकार्यं करोति । p. 275.

101. ननु मम प्रत्यक्षं न गता । तन्न जाने किं पद्भ्यां गता उत प्रवहणेनेति । p. 275.

102. cf. अस्यार्यचारुदत्तस्य । वसन्तसेनारूढा पुष्पकरण्डकजीर्णोद्यानं क्रीडितुं नीयत इति प्रवहणवाहकेन कथितम्। p. 276.

103. cf. सावशेषैः केशहस्तपाणिपादैरुपलाक्षितं मया । p. 277.

104. cf. अहो धिग्वैषम्यं लोकव्यवहारस्य । and the following stanza. (IX. 25).

105. आर्यचारुदत्त सत्यमभिधीयताम्। p. 278.

106. cf. हंहो अधिकरणभोजका: किं यूयं पक्षपातेन व्यवहारं पश्यत येनाद्याप्येष हताशचारुदत्त आसने धार्यते। p. 279.

107. विचार्यताम्। भो अधिकृताः विचार्यताम्। p. 279.

108. cf. प्रेषितश्च मया तद्वार्तान्वेषणाय मैत्रेयो वसन्तसेनासकाशं शकटिकानिमित्तं च तस्य प्रदत्तान्यलङ्करणानि प्रत्यर्पयितुम्। तत् कथं चिरयते । p. 280.

109. Read the speech of Maitreya on p. 280 f.

110. (अधिकृताः सर्वेऽधोमुखाः स्थिता:). p. 284.

111. cf. अयमेवंविधे काले दृष्टो भूषणविस्तरः ।
अस्माकं भाग्यवैषम्यात् पतितः पातयिष्यति ॥ IX. 31.

112. cf. कष्टं भोः कष्टम् ।
अङ्गारकविरुद्धस्य प्रक्षीणस्य बृहस्पतेः ।
ग्रहोऽयमपरः पार्श्वे धूमकेतुरिवोत्थितः ॥ IX. 33

113. For she declares, सदृशमेतत् न पुनस्तत् । p. 285.

114. इहात्रभवत्या दुहितुः p. 286.

115. cf. एवं गतानि । अां इदम् । (p. 286) ; आभरणानि आभरणानीति न जाने । किन्त्वस्मद्गृहादानीतानीति जाने । (p. 287).

116. cf. IX. 32.

117. cf. IX. 36.

118. cf. IX. 37–38 and the prose passage there (p.287).

119. Read her speech on p. 288.

120. कृतं मयात्मनः सदृशम् । सांप्रतं गच्छामि । p. 289.

121. cf. आर्यचारुदत्त निर्णये वयं प्रमाणं शेषे तु राजा । तथापि शोधनक विज्ञाप्यतां राजा पालकः । अयं हि पातकी विप्रो न वध्यो मनुरब्रवीत् । राष्ट्रादस्मात्तु निर्वास्यो विभवैरक्षतैः सह ॥ IX. 39.

122. cf. अहो आविमृश्यकारी राजा पालकः । etc. p. 289.

123. cf. IX. 43.

124. cf. यथा यथेदं निपुणं विचार्यते तथा तथा सङ्कटमेव दृश्यते । IX. 25 ab.

125. cf. IX. 43.

126. cf. Karmarkar, Introduction, p. xxvi and Notes p. 485 ; Kale, Introduction, p. lxi, and Notes, p. 151 and Paranjpe, Introduction p. x liii f.

127. cf. शेषमेषोऽभिधास्यति । IX. 38d.

128. cf. IX 36.

129. see note 114 above.

130. See 115 above.

131. cf. असम्बद्धः खल्वसि। (p. 272); IX. 19 c ; IX. 27–28; also read उच्यमानमप्यवस्थादोषान्न गृह्यते। p. 282 ; IX. 37.

132. For the admissibility of ordeals cf. अनुमाने च संभ्रान्ते तत्र दिव्यं विशोधनम्।.

133. IX. 8-9.

134. असंबद्ध as चारुदत calls it ; and even the judge, at the commencement of the trial, thinks it impossible.

135. cf. X. 8–10.

136. cf. X. 12.

137. cf. भो स्वजातिमहत्तर इच्छाम्यहं भवतः सकाशात्प्रतिग्रहं कर्तुम्। p. 298.

138. cf. किं पुत्राय प्रयच्छामि। (आत्मानमवलोक्य। यज्ञोपवीतं दृष्ट्वा)। आम् इदं तावदस्ति। अमौक्तिकमसौवर्णं ब्राह्मणानां विभूषणम्। देवतानां पितॄणां च भागो येन प्रदीयते। X. 18.

139. cf. X. 12-13 ; 25 ; 33.

140. cf. X. 13.

141. cf. X. 31.

142. cf. X. 28 ; also cf. नन्वेष तपस्वी हेतुभूतः कृतान्तो मां व्याहरति। p. 282.

143. cf. X. 12, 13, 25, 34 and particularly X. 27.

144. cf. प्रभवति यदि धर्मो दूषितस्यापि मेऽद्य। etc. X. 34.

145. X. 23 and the prose passages before and after it.

146. Particularly when we find all declaring 'अहो त्वया मारिता। नार्यचारुदत्तेन।' p. 308.

147. cf. शोभनं भणति। वितप्तश्चेटः किं न प्रलपति। p. 309.

148. cf. ननु भणामि सपुत्रं चारुदत्तं व्यापादयतमिति। p. 311.

149. cf. न ह्यावयोरीदृशी राजाज्ञप्तिः यथा सपुत्रं चारुदत्तं व्यापादतमिति ।:p. 311.

150. p. 313 f.

151. व्यपनयतु कलङ्कं स्वस्वभावेन सैव । X. 34 d.

152. cf. X. 35 and the prose passage before it.

153. X. 37 and the following prose passage.

154. cf. प्रतिष्ठितमात्रेण तव सुहृदार्यकेणोज्जयिन्यां वेणातटे कुशावत्यां राज्यमतिसृष्टम् । तत् प्रतिमान्यतां प्रथमः सुहृत्प्रणयः । p. 327.

155. cf. X. 55.

156. cf. यत्सूर्योदयभयतः कविनोचितपात्रमेलनं न कृतम् ।
सुन्दरयुक्तिभिररचयदाचन्दनकोक्ति नीलकण्ठस्तत् ॥

157. X. 59.

158. आर्ये वसन्तसेने परितुष्टो राजा भवतीं वधूशब्देनानुगृह्णाति । p. 336.

159. लब्धा चारित्रशुद्धिश्चरणनिपतितः शत्रुरप्येष मुक्तः
प्रोत्खाताराातिमूलः प्रियसुहृदचलामार्यकः शास्ति राजा ।
प्राप्ता भूयः प्रियेयं प्रियसुहृदि भवान् संगतो मे वयस्यो
लभ्यं किं चातिरिक्तं यदपरमधुना प्रार्थयेऽहं भवन्तम् ॥ X. 59.

160. X. 61.

CHAPTER IV

1. स खलु सार्थवाहविनयदत्तस्य नप्ता सागरदत्तस्य तनयः सुगृहीतनामधेय आर्यचारुदत्तो नाम श्रेष्ठिचत्वरे प्रतिवसति । p. 266, 296.

2. cf. प्रणयिजनसंक्रान्तविभवस्य...परिक्षयोऽपि तेऽधिकतरं रमणीयः । p. 12 ; दीनानां कल्पवृक्षः (I. 48) ; सोऽस्मद्विधानां प्रणयैः कृशीकृतो...नृणां स तृष्णामपनीय शुष्कवान् । (I. 46); स इदानीमनुक्रोशकृतैः (प्रदानैः उपरतविभवः संवृत्तः) । p. 69. Also read मैत्रेय's speech on p. 282 f.

3. cf. कथमभिमुखमनाभ्युदयिकं श्रमणकदर्शनम् । (p. 207) ; also cf. IX. 10–13 and 15.

28. cf. चारुदत्त's स्वगत remark 'किं प्रच्छन्नं गतेति ब्रवीमि।' which shows why चारुदत्त is hasitating all the while and not making a plain statement.

29. This is elear from the fact that वसन्तसेना takes off the वध्यमाला from चारुदत्त and throws it on शकार (p. 329).

30. cf. तस्य राष्ट्रियश्यालस्य यथैव क्रिया पूर्वमासीत् वर्तमाने तथैवास्यास्तु । (p. 337).

31. cf. I. 7c.

32. cf. मन्दभागिनी खल्वहं तवाभ्यन्तरस्य। p. 40; also cf. I. 56.

Also note how she shows respect to मदनिका, her maid, after her marriage with शर्विलक (p. 122).

33. cf. कथमार्यचारुदत्तस्य संकीर्तनेन ईदृशो म आदरः । p. 70.

34. e. g the प्रावारक, which she puts on in Act I and takes over from her servant कर्णपूरक in Act III.

35. cf. कथम् एषा केनापि पुरुषकेण सह मन्त्रयमाणा तिष्ठति ।–मा कस्यापि प्रीतिच्छेदो भवतु । (p. 110).

36. Note the प्रतिसंदेश of वसन्तसेना (p. 121).

37. नम आर्यचारुदत्ताय । p. 240.

38. cf. the चित्रफलक in Act IV.

39. cf. Her talk with चेटी in the beginning of Act II.

40. cf. How and why she deposited her ornaments with चारुदत्त (p. 52) ; how she accepted the रत्नावली and returned the अलङ्कारs with a message similar to that of चारुदत्त. (p. 140 ; 165ff).

41. cf. This is shown by her not disturbing मदनिका's talk with शर्विलक. (p. 110).

42. cf. कथमनुनयोऽप्यस्य भयमुत्पादयति । (p. 21) कथं मम नयनयोरायासकरः स एव राजश्यालः । (p. 223) ; Also cf. VIII, 32-33. etc.

43. Note how boldy she meets शकार in Act VIII; Also cf. IV. 33; V. 28-32.

44. cf. V. 25-27.

45. Note how she helped संवाहक.

46. cf. अद्याहं न स्नास्यामि। तद् ब्राह्मण एव पूजां निर्वर्तयतु इति। p. 41.

47. cf. वसन्तसेना:— चेटि किं प्रविष्टाहमभ्यन्तरम्।
चेटी:—न केवलमभ्यन्तरचतु:शालकम्। सर्वजनस्यापि हृदयं प्रविष्टा।
वसन्तसेना:—अपि संतप्स्यते परिजन:।
चेटी:—संतप्स्यते।
वसन्तसेना:—कदा।
चेटी:—यदार्या गमिष्यति। (p. 175 cf.).

48. cf. चन्दनक's remark (p. 190) and VI. 14; विट's remark on p. 223; and VIII. 16 and 23; V. 12.

49. cf. किमिति न जानामि तां तादृशीं नगरमण्डनं काञ्चनशतभूषणाम्। (p. 262).

50. cf. VIII. 23.

51. Note how she is irritated at her mother's message that she should go in शकार's cart. p. 107.

52. This is displayed by her when she asks शर्विलक to take her return message to चारुदत्त (p. 121); and also when she returns the ornaments to चारुदत्त with a message similar to his own. (Act V, p. 165 ff).

53. See Paranjape, Introduction, p. xliii f.

54. आर्ये वसन्तसेने परितुष्टो राजा भवतीं वधूशब्देनानुगृह्णाति। p. 336.

55. cf. VIII. 35; I. 25, 29, 39 etc.

56. cf. अहं वरपुरुषमनुष्यो वासुदेव: कामयितव्य:। p. 21; VIII.

36–37; IX. 6 and शकार's speech after IX. 37; IX. 1 & 2 where he describes himself.

57. This he shows when वसन्तसेना calls out to her servants (Act I) and when he gets into his cart and finds वसन्तसेना therein whom he mistakes for राक्षसी or चौर. (Act VI).

58. cf. कः स गर्भदास्याः पुत्रः ।; or के तस्य गुणाः यस्य गृहं प्रविश्याशितव्यमपि नास्ति । (p. 34); दरिद्रः खलु सः । तस्य सर्वं संभाव्यते। p. 255.

59. Note how he threatens the judge and also his further remark यद्यदहं भणिष्यामि तत्तत् प्रत्याययिष्यामि । (p. 260).

60. Note how he makes his चेट take the cart over the प्राकारखण्ड saying that he does not care even if he as well as the bulls die. (p. 220).

61. cf. दारिद्र्यचारुदत्तस्येदं कृपणचेष्टितं पातयिष्यामि । (p. 255). Also read: अरे वसन्तसेनां स्वयमेव मारयित्वा मां दूषयित्वा कुत्र पलायसे । सांप्रतमीदृशोऽहमनाथः प्राप्तः । addressed by शकार to विट (p. 244).

62. Note the manner in which he tries to persuade विट to share the crime with him at VIII. 40; and also cf. मदीये पुष्पकरण्डकजीर्णोद्याने वसन्तसेनां मारयित्वा कुत्र पलायसे । मम आवुत्तस्याग्रतो व्यवहारं देहि । (p 246); and how he tries to bribe his चेट with अलंकार and when he does not accept it, how he declares that the चेट had stolen away that ornament. (p. 309).

63. The height is reached when शकार requests चारुदत्त and even वसन्तसेना to save him (p. 328–329).

64. See pp. 36–37.

65. pp. 212–214 (between विट and शकार concerning संवाहक); pp. 219–20 (with चेट); or pp. 242 (with विट).

66. See note 29 above.

67. विपर्यस्तमनश्चेष्टैः शिलाशकलवर्ष्मभिः ।
मांसवृक्षैरियं मूर्खैर्भाराक्रान्ता वसुन्धरा ॥ VIII. 6.

68. अपार्थमक्रमं व्यर्थं पुनरुक्तं हतोपमम् ।
लोकन्यायविरुद्धं च शकारवचनं विदुः ॥

69. Note that he is called काकपदशीर्षमस्तक (p. 26 & 283); he refers to his stick as अस्मादृशजनभागधेयकुटिल (p. 31) and तव (= of शकार)हृदयकुटिल (p. 283); he is called दुष्टबटुक by not only शकार (p. 36, 37), but even कुम्भीलक (p. 149). Also see p. 43 where his describes his head as being करभजानुसदृश.

70. Read his soliloquy in the beginning of Act I; and description of the पञ्चम प्रकोष्ठ of वसन्तसेना's home (p. 130 f) : cf. how he complains about वसन्तसेना to चारुदत्त (p. 144).

71. Read his talk with कुम्भीलक on pp. 150 ff.

72. cf. भूम्यामेव मया ताडितगर्दभेनेव पुनरपि लोठितव्यम् । or यथा सर्वनागानां मध्ये डुण्डुभः तथा सर्वब्राह्मणानां मध्येऽहं ब्राह्मणः । (p. 84, 85). Also see p. 45.

73. Note how he refuses to go out to offer the बलि (p. 15) ; and goes out only when रदनिका is asked to accompany him (p. 27).

74. Note that चारुदत्त calls him सर्वकालमित्र (p. 11) ; Also read मैत्रेय's replies to शकार's questions (p. 36–37).

75. Note how he threatens (p. 31 f).

76. Hence he expresses his willingness to go out (p. 27) and tells चारुदत्त that वसन्तसेना would see him that evening (p. 148).

77. e. g. चेटि किं भवत्या इहैव स्वप्तव्यम् । (p. 169);

78. He can't answer the simple questions put to him by कुम्भीलक (p. 151).

79. p. 44, Also read p. 101.

80. Note how he advises चारुदत्त to disown the न्यास. (p. 99).

81. cf. His exhortation against गणिकाप्रसङ्ग on p. 146-147.

82. अहं खल्वपलपिष्यामि केन दत्तं केन गृहीतं को वा साक्षीति। (p. 99).

83. cf. भवति समर्प्यतां मम स्नानशाटिका। (p. 169).

84. As his view about वसन्तसेना actually is seen to be (p. 165).

85. Note how he at once threatens शकार in Act I and Act IX.

86. This is shown by his being pacified by the soft obeisance of विट. (p. 32–33).

87. भो भद्रमुखौ मुञ्चतं प्रियवयस्यं चारुदत्तम्। मां व्यापदयतम् (p.302); भो वयस्य अहं ते प्रियवयस्यो भूत्वा त्वया विरहितान् प्राणान् धारयामि। (p. 290); Also p. 310.

88. cf. वरमिदानीं स शरीरेण परिक्षतः न पुनश्चारित्रेण। (p. 100).

89. आर्यपुत्र एव ममाभरणविशेष इति जानातु भवती। (p. 176).

90. यद्यस्माकमार्या जननी तत् किमर्थमलङ्कृता। (p. 179)

91. अपेहि। न ग्रहीष्यामि। रोदिषि त्वम्। (p. 179).

92. व्यापादयतं माम्। मुञ्चतं पितरम्। (p. 301).

93. वरं पापाचरणम्। न पुनरार्यपुत्रस्यामङ्गलाकर्णनम्। (p. 333).

94. Read X 58 and धूता's reply to it. (p. 335).

95. III. 21.

96. साधु मदनिके साधु। अभुजिष्ययेव मन्त्रितम्। (p. 119).

97. Read मयाप्यस्मद्ब्राह्मणकुले धिक्कृतमन्धकारम्। etc. (p.92f.).

98. III. 99 and the following speech ; IV. 5.

99. III. 22 ;

100. See how he bursts into a volley of vituperations against women—particularly courtesans. pp. 114–116.

101. cf. IV. 6 ;

102. cf. IV. 25.

103. कलेति शिक्षिता। आजीविकेदानीं संवृत्ता। (p. 67).

104. अहमेतेन द्यूतकरापमानेन शाक्यश्रमणको भविष्यामि। p. 74.

105. ईदृशमनित्यत्वं प्रेक्ष्य द्विगुणतरो मम प्रव्रज्यायां बहुमानः संवृत्तः। and चारुदत्त's remark thereon.

106. Note how he tries to avoid माथुर first, but then faces him quite boldly. (p. 60 ff).

107. सर्वश्चास्मद्विधो जनस्तमनुसरति। तदहमपि तत्समीपमेव गच्छामि (p. 65).

108. प्राप्ते च राजकार्ये पितरमप्यहं न जानामि। VI. 15 cd.

109. cf. VI. 21 and 22.

110. cf. X. 22.

111. अरे आर्यचारुदत्तं निरुपपदेन नाम्नाभिलषसि। अरे पश्य। and the following two verses. X. 19 and 20.

112. cf. X. 1.

113. अरे भणितोऽस्मि पित्रा स्वर्गं गच्छता यथा पुत्र वीरक यदि तव वध्यपालिका भवति मा सहसा व्यापदयसि वध्यम्। etc. p. 313 f.

114. cf. VIII. 6 ; also read VIII. 26 where he draws a contrast between शकार and चेट.

115. cf. I. 46 and 48.

116. Note how he is arguing in favour of शकार's suit (I. 31–32) ; but how he gives वसन्तसेना a hint to take off her ornaments and flowers (I. 35). He really appreciates वसन्तसेना's love for चारुदत्त and says ' सुष्ठु खल्विदमुच्यते रत्नं रत्नेन संग-

च्छते इति । तद् गच्छतु । किमनेन मूर्खेण । (p. 23). Also Note his sad feelings on finding वसन्तसेना in शकार's cart (VIII. 16) and the following words addressed to वसन्तसेना (p. 223 f.)

117. V. 34.

118. Read his conversation with शकार when the latter asks him to murder वसन्तसेना (p. 231 ff); VIII. 25. It may be noted that even शकार's विट shares these qualities cf. VIII. 23–24.

119. Read : प्रभवति भट्टकः शरीरस्य न चारित्रस्य । (p. 230); ताडयतु भट्टकः मारयतु भट्टकः अकार्यं न करिष्यामि । (p. 232 f).

120. सर्वमस्य मूर्खस्य संभाव्यते । भद्र उच्यताम्—आगच्छ दृश्यते तव व्यवहारः । (p. 259).

121. Note how the judge plainly tells शकार that शील is more important than कुल (IX. 7) ; Also cf. IX. 21 and 22; and see how he offers a seat to चारुदत्त inspite of शकार's protests (p. 270).

122. सुनिश्चिंतं खलु दारिकया यौवनम् । (p. 271).

123. प्रसीदन्तु प्रसीदन्त्वार्यमिश्राः ।...... । तद्यदि व्यापादिता मम दारिका व्यापादिता । जावतु मे दीर्घायुः । अन्यच्च । अर्थिप्रत्यर्थिनोः व्यवहारः । अहमर्थिनी । तन्मुञ्चतैतम् । (p. 288) ; also note how she has tried to save चारुदत्त by declaring 'सदृशमेतत् न पुनस्तत्' (p. 285).

124. In the beginning of Act IV.

125. Ryder, Introduction, p. XVI.

CHAPTER V

1. cf. कथासरित्सागर II. 4. 78–195.
2. cf. कथासरित्सागर X. 2. 1–54.
3. cf. उच्छ्वास II, pp. 83 ff. (Kale's edition, 1925).

4. See Devasthali, 'Introduction to the study of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa', pp. 12 and 144.

5. For other similar incidents see Nerurkar's edition of the मृच्छकटिक, Appendix II [Extracts from Sylvain Levi's *Le Theatre Indien*].

6. For details read Dr. Pusalkar, Bhāsa (Bhāratīya Vidyā Studies, No. 1), pp. 118-120.

7. नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोश quotes from the चारुदत्त the following couplet —

शुष्कद्रुमगतो रौति आदित्याभिमुखं स्थितः।
कथयत्यनिमित्तं मे वायसो ज्ञानपण्डित: ॥

With this couplet cf. मृच्छकटिक IX. 10 and 11.

This नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोश as well as नाट्यदर्पण both refer to the मृच्छकटिक and the चारुदत्त as two different works; and the above reference to the चारुदत्त shows how चारुदत्त must have developed. सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण quotes a verse as addressed by विट to शकार. शकार किं प्रार्थनया प्रावारेण मिषेण वा। अकार्यवर्जं मे ब्रूहि किमभीष्टं करोमि ते ॥. Passages corresponding to this verse are found in मृच्छकटिक Act VIII.

8. cf. Sukthankar Memorial Edition, Vol. II. p, 122.

9. cf. ibid, p. 124. Also cf. Dr. Pusalkar, Loc. cit., pp. 117 ff.

10. cf. अथ प्रकरणे वृत्तमुत्पाद्यं लोकसंश्रयम्। दशरूपक III.

11. cf. प्रख्यातोत्पाद्यमिश्रत्वभेदात् त्रेधापि तत् त्रिधा।
प्रख्यातमितिहासादेरुत्पाद्यं कविकल्पितम् ॥
मिश्रं च संकरात् ताभ्यां दिव्यमर्त्यादिभेदतः॥ दशरूपक I. 15-16.

12. The मृच्छकटिक has a few ideas found in other technical works. Thus the idea of the various circumstances under which a culprit is released (Act X) correspond to

कौटिल्य's अर्थशास्त्र where we get circumstances for बन्धमोक्ष. Similarly the distinction between भुजिष्या, अभुजिष्या and वधू in our play corresponds to दासी, अदासी and कुलस्त्री in कौ. अर्थशास्त्र. The astronomical and legal ideas have been already referred to in chapter I above.

CHAPTER VI

1. cf. NSP. edition (1950), p. 2.
2. cf. Sukthankar Memorial Edition, Vol. II. p. 122f.
3. cf. p. 181; p. 61; p. 74.
4. cf. 307.
5. cf. p. 247 f.
6. cf. pp. 86–91.
7. cf. V. 1–6.
8. cf. p. 44 f.
9. cf. Devasthali, Introduction to the study of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa, p. 111 f.
10. cf. p. 23–68.
11. p. 71 f.
12. p. 40.
13. p. 174 ff.
14. p. 100 ff.
15. p. 123, 183.
16. cf. कर्णपूरक जानीहि तावत् किमेष जातीकुसुमवासितः प्रावारको न वेति । p. 78.
17. cf. आश्चर्यम् जातीकुसुमवासितः प्रावारकः । अनुदासीनमस्य यौवनं प्रतिभासते । p. 40.

18. cf. एष चार्य चारुदत्तस्य प्रियवयस्येन चूर्णवृद्धेन जातिकुसुमवासित: प्रावारकोऽनुप्रेषितः etc. p. 10.

19. p. 40.

20. cf. तत आर्य एकेन शून्यान्याभरणस्थानानि परामृश्य ऊर्ध्वं प्रेक्ष्य दीर्घं निःश्वस्यायं प्रावारको ममोपरि क्षिप्तः । p. 78.

21. cf. इयं च म एका मातृगृहलब्धा रत्नावली तिष्ठति । p. 100.

22. It may also be noted that this incident of चा॰ giving away रत्नावली in repayment of the न्यास has been utilised again in the Act IX where वसन्तसेना's mother is made to argue that चारुदत्त who did this can never be guilty of a murder for the sake of money. cf. p. 275.

23. cf. II. 10. and भर्तारः पश्यत जर्जरपटप्रावृतोऽयं पुरुषो दशसुवर्णं कल्यवर्तं भणति । p. 62.

24. It is by following the रुधिरपथ that संवाहक is traced by the सभिक and the द्यूतकर p. 66.

25. cf. III. 16; and also X. 18.

26. The skill shown by Śūdraka in using these things and events has been discussed in Chapter III. q. v.

27. See chapter III, Act VII above.

28. cf. Paranjpe, Introduction, p. xxxix.

29. cf. दिवसावसानकार्यं यद्यङ्के नोपपद्यते सर्वम् । अङ्कच्छेदं कृत्वा प्रवेशकैस्तद्विधेयं हि ॥ नाट्य॰ 18. 26.

30. cf. अङ्कच्छेदं कृत्वा मासकृतं वर्षसंचितं वापि । तत्सर्वं कर्तव्यं वर्षादूर्ध्वं च न तु कश्चित् ॥ नाट्य॰ 18. 31.

31. cf. अन्यच्च एतस्यां प्रदोषवेलायां etc. p. 15.

32. cf. बलीयसि खल्वन्धकारे माषराशिप्रविष्टेव मसीगुटिका दृश्यमानैव प्रणष्टा वसन्तसेना । p. 24; Also cf. I. 23 and 35 a.

33. cf. I. 57.

34. cf. आर्ये मातादिशति — स्नाता भूत्वा देवतानां पूजां निर्वर्तय इति । (This shows that it is early morning). p. 48.

35. अतिक्रामत्यर्धरजनी । p. 81.

36. cf. III. 6.

37. cf. III. 10.

38. अद्याप्येतत्तिष्ठति। किमत्रोज्जयिन्यां चौरोऽपि नास्ति य एतं दास्याः पुत्रं निद्राचौरं नापहरति । p. 85.

39. cf. IV. 115; अयि प्रभाते मया श्रुतं श्रेष्ठिचत्वरे । etc. p. 113.

40. अहमपि प्रदोष आर्यं प्रेक्षितुमागच्छामि इति । p. 140.

41. cf. उन्नमत्यकालदुर्दिनम् । p. 141; 142.

42. चेटि किं भवत्या इहैव स्वप्तव्यम् । p. 169.

43. चेटि सुष्ठु न निध्यातो रात्रौ । तदद्य प्रत्यक्षं प्रेक्षिष्ये । p. 175.

44. अर्धोदिते दिनकरे गोपालदारकः खुटितः । p. 188. (VI.11 cd).

45. cf. VIII. 10; also of माध्याह्निकः सूर्यः । p. 218.

46. अनुशोचत इयं कथमपि रात्रिः प्रभाता मे । IX. 23. ed.

47. cf. X. 29.

48. cf. Journal of the Jha Research Institute, Vol. III. p. 295–299.

49. cf. Karmarkar, Intro. p. XXI; Kale, Intro. p. Xlii.

50. cf. Paranjpe, Notes, p. 37f.; Ryder, Intro p.XXVI.

51. अचिरेणैव कालेन । p. 44. But it must be noted that चारुदत्त himself later on asks मैत्रेय to take care of the ornaments until they are returned (cf. III. 7 d).

52. p. 85.

53. cf. Paranjpe, Note p. 37 f.

54. cf. Kale, Intro. p. Xliv. Also cf. Karmarkar;

Introduction, XX—XXII where he takes चैत्र कृष्ण षष्ठी as the starting point.

54. cf. प्रधानसभिको माथुरो मया विरोधितः । etc. p. 65.

55. cf. IV. 26–27.

56. pp. 183 ff.

57. X. 46–47.

58. cf. e.g. how चारुदत्त is introduced on the stage in Act 1 (p. 10) or वसन्तसेना in Acts II, IV and VI (pp. 40, 105, 175), or मैत्रेय in Act 1 (p. 9), Act IX (p. 280); etc.

59. cf e.g. The appearance of आर्यक on the stage in Act VI (p. 183).

60. There are perhaps two places (p. 277–279) where शूद्रक's use of this stage direction (or of निष्क्रान्तः । प्रविश्य च) mars the verisimilitude very seriously. In other places where similar direction is used शूद्रक has tried to preserve verisimilitude as far as possible by representing the dramatis peraonae concerned actually on their way and expressing some relevent thought. (cf. pp. 264, 266, etc).

61. cf. See note 37 on page.

62. cf. pp. 25, 53, 83, 86, 93, 171, 192, 240 etc.

64. See p. 92 above.

65. e. g. किं भणसि—चौरं कर्तयित्वा सन्धिर्निष्क्रान्तः । p. 95.

66. e.g. भूम्यामेव मया ताडितगर्दभेनेव पुनरपि लोठितव्यम् । p. 84.

67. e.g. गणिका नाम पादुकान्तरप्रविष्टेव लेष्टुका दुःखेन पुनर्निराक्रियते । p. 174; or अक्रन्दसमुत्थिता पद्मिनी, अवञ्चको वणिक्, अचौरः सुवर्णकारः, अकलहो ग्रामसमागमः, अलुब्धा गणिकेति दुष्करमेते संभाव्यन्ते । p. 145.

68. मनुष्योऽपि काकलीं गायन् शुष्कसुमनोदामवेष्टितो वृद्धपुरोहित इव मन्त्रं जपन् दृढं मे न रोचते। p. 82.

69. भवति समर्प्यतां मम स्नाननाटिका। p. 169.

70. e.g. when he asks the following question to चेटी:– चेटि किं भवत्या इहैव स्वप्तव्यम्। p. 169.

71. p. 37 f.

72. pp. 150–52.

73. pp. 212 ff., 229 f, 242.

74. pp. 210 ff.

75. pp. 219 f.; 230 f.

76. p. 330.

76s. For definitions of the Saṁdhis cf. द० रू० I. 22 ff.

77. cf. Introduction, p. xxii.

CHAPTER VII

1. cf. I. 32 c.

2. cf. IX. 39.

3. Such ब्राह्मणs were known as अप्रतिग्राहक (cf. p. 92).

4. चन्दनक is a चर्मकार (cf. VI. 23), while वीरक is a नापित (cf. VI. 22).

5. आर्यक is only a गोपालदारक (cf. VI. 11).

6. cf. I. 32 a.

7. cf. Devasthali, 'Introduction to the study of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa', p. 122 f; and p. 165, n. 3.

8. cf. उपारूढस्नेहमपि प्रणयिजनं परित्यज्य देशान्तरगमनेन वाणिजजनो महद् वियोगजं दुःखमुत्पादयति। p. 49.

9. e.g. पुरस्थापन, विहार, आराम, देवालय, तडाग, कूप etc. (p. 283).

10. Note how मैत्रेय has played on the expression यान-पात्राणि in Act IV. (p. 136 f.).

11. cf. सुष्ठु खलूच्यते। अकन्दसमुत्थिता पद्मिनी, अवञ्चको वणिक्, अचौरः सुवर्णकारः, अकलहो ग्रामसमागमः, अलुब्धा गणिकेति दुष्करमेते संभाव्यन्ते। (p. 145).

12. cf. IX. 14 c. Also cf.

13. Read the detailed description of the वसन्तसेनाभवन given by मैत्रेय in Act IV.

14. cf. अपमानितानिर्धनकामुका इव गणिका etc. (p. 46); Also cf. III. 15.

15. cf. गणिका नाम पादुकान्तरप्रविष्टेव लेष्टुका दुःखेन पुनर्निराक्रियते। (p. 147).

16. cf. I. 31 and 32; Also cf. यस्यार्थास्तस्य सा कान्ता धनहार्यो ह्यसौ जनः। V. 9 ab.

17. cf. मन्दभागिनी खल्वहं तवाभ्यन्तरस्य। (p. 40); अलं चतुःशालमिमं प्रवेश्य प्रकाशनारीधृत एष यस्मात्। (III. 7 ab).

18. cf. इयं रङ्गप्रवेशेन कलानां चोपशिक्षया। वञ्चनापण्डितत्वेन स्वरनैपुण्यमाश्रिता॥ (I. 42). Also cf. the description of the fourth प्रकोष्ठ of वसन्तसेना's भवन. (p. 130 f.).

19. cf. पुरुषपरिचयेन च प्रगल्भं न वदति यद्यपि भाषते बहूनि। (I. 43 cd); also किं वेशवासदाक्षिण्येन मदनिके एवं भणसि (p. 105), and मदनिका's reply to it.

20. cf. गुणः खल्वनुरागस्य कारणं न बलात्कारः। (p. 23); Also cf. गुणहार्यस्त्वसौ जनः। (V. 9).

21. cf. यदि मां जीवन्तीमिच्छसि तदेवं न पुनरहं मान्त्रादिष्टव्या। (p. 107).

22. cf. IV. 24.

23. Note how he shows regard for मदनिका after her marriage with शर्विलक by saying 'सांप्रतं त्वमेव वन्दनीया संवृत्ता।' p. 122).

24. cf. आर्ये वसन्तसेने परितुष्टो राजा भवतीं वधूशब्देनानुगृह्णाति। (p. 336).

25. cf. अर्थतः पुरुषो नारी या नारी सार्थतः पुमान्। (III. 27).

26. cf. इयं च मे एका मातृगृहलब्धा रत्नावली तिष्ठति। (p. 100).

27. cf. आर्यपुत्र एव ममाभरणविशेष इति जानातु भवती। (p. 176).

28. cf. चेटि किं भणसि अपरिक्षतशरीर आर्यपुत्र इति। वरमिदानीं स शरीरेण परिक्षतो न पुनश्चारित्रेण। (p. 100).

29. cf. बिभेम्यार्यपुत्रस्यामङ्गलाकर्णनात्। वरं पापाचरणं न पुनरार्यपुत्रस्यामङ्गलाकर्णनम्। (p. 333).

30. cf. जात मुञ्च माम्। विघ्नं मा कुरुष्व। (p. 333); Also cf. एषार्यचारुदत्तस्य वधूरार्या धूता पदे वसनाञ्चले विलगन्तं दारकमाक्षिपन्ती बाष्पभरितैर्जनैर्निवार्यमाणा प्रज्वलिते पावके प्रविशति। (p. 331).

31. cf. भवन्त्यास्तावद् ब्राह्मण्या भिन्नत्वेन चिताधिरोहणं पापमुदाहरन्ति ऋषयः। to which धूता's reply is 'वरं पापाचरणम्। न पुनरार्यपुत्रस्यामङ्गलाकर्णनम्। (p. 333).

32. cf. III. 28.

33. cf. IV. 24; Also note how वसन्तसेना feels happy on receiving the title of वधू from the new king. (p. 337).

34. cf. IV. 9–17; Also cf. V. 14 d.

35. cf. ज्योत्स्ना दुर्बलभर्तृकेव वनिता प्रोत्सार्य मेघैर्हृता। V. 20 d.

36. cf. द्वयमिदमतीव लोके प्रियं नराणां सुहृच्च वनिता च। संप्रति तु सुन्दरीणां शतादपि सुहृद्विशिष्टतमः॥ IV. 25.

37. cf. भो भद्रमुखौ मुञ्चतं मम प्रियवयस्यं चारुदत्तम्। मां व्यापादयतम् (p. 302). Also read his reply to धूता on p. 334.

38. cf. भवत्यास्तावद् ब्राह्मण्या भिन्नत्वेन चिताधिरोहणं पापमुदाहरन्ति ऋषयः। (p. 333).

39. cf. The famous passage beginning with यदेतदनुमरणं नाम तदतिनिष्फलम् ।

40. cf. कथं द्यूतकरमण्डल्या बद्धोऽस्मि । कष्टम्, एषोऽस्माकं द्यूतकराणामलंघनीयः समयः । (p. 57).

41. cf. II. 12.

42. cf. II. 8, 9, 11.

43. cf. II. 7 and 11.

44. cf. The remark of माथुर after receiving the bracelet from मदनिका: 'अरे भणसि तं कुलपुत्रं भूतस्तव गण्डः आगच्छ पुनर्द्यूतं रमस्व । (p. 73).

45. cf. II. 17 and also cf. ईदृशमनित्यत्वं प्रेक्ष्य द्विगुणतरो मम प्रव्रज्यायां बहुमानः संवृत्तः । (p. 337).

46. cf. II. 5, 6.

47. शर्विलक's remark on p. 89.

48. cf. p. 87 f. and III 12 and 13.

49. cf. IV 6, also cf. IV. 3.

50. cf. IV. 10.

51. cf. III. 20, 21.

52. cf. शर्विलक भणिता मयार्या । ततो भणति । यदि ममच्छन्दस्तदार्य विनार्थं सर्वं परिजनमभुजिष्यं करिष्यामि । p. 111.

53. cf. हन्त ईदृशो दासभावः यत् सत्यं न कमपि प्रत्याययति । p. 309.

54. cf. प्रभवति भट्टकः शरीरस्य न चारित्रस्य । (p. 231); ताडयतु भट्टकः मारयतु भट्टकः अकार्यं न करिष्यामि । and VIII. 25 (p. 233).

55. cf. I. 9–15; 53; III. 24, 27; V. 8, 9; X. 16, etc.

56. cf. यौवनमत्रापराध्यति न चारित्रम् । (and yet it should be noted that चारु० does feel a bit ashamed to confess that

a गणिका was a friend of his, as is shown by the preceding sentence) p. 271.

57. cf. I. 16.

58. cf. संन्यासः कुलदूषणैरिव जनैर्मेघैर्वृतश्चन्द्रमाः। (V. 14 c). It is however more likely that संन्यास here refers to a mendicant's life in general rather than to the fourth आश्रम of the वर्णाश्रमधर्म. The expression प्रव्रज्या is similarly used by संवाहक in Act X. (p. 337).

59. cf. The conversation between शकार and चेट (p.232) ending with VIII. 25.

60. Note how स्थावरक tries to save चारुदत्त by giving out the facts. p. 303, 305, 307 etc.

61. cf. VIII. 5.

62. cf. सखे दृढोऽस्य निश्चयः। तत् पृथिव्यां सर्वविहारेषु कुलपतिरयं क्रियताम्। p. 337.

63. cf. भवतु धर्माक्षराण्युदाहरामि। — अथवालं ममैतेन स्वर्गेण etc. p. 250.

64. cf. VIII. 1–3.

65. cf. कथमभिमुखमनाभ्युदयिकं श्रमणकदर्शनम्। p. 207.

66. cf. आर्यचारुदत्त निर्णये वयं प्रमाणम्। शेषे तु राजा। p. 289.

67. cf IX. 40–41.

68. cf. शकार's threat to अधिकरणिक (p. 259).

69. cf. IX. 5.

70. संक्षेपादपवाद एव सुलभो द्रष्टुर्गुणो दूरतः। (IX. 3 d and 4 d)

71. This is shown by शकार's threat on p. 259.

72. cf. IX. 36.

73. The ordeals are referred to in IX. 43.

74. cf. I. 57.

75. cf. The conversation between वीरक and चन्दनक on p. 189 f.

76. cf. X. 54.

77. cf. II. I2.

78. cf. X. 2, 3, 5, 21.

79. cf. X. 1.

80. cf. कदापि कोऽपि साधुरर्थं दत्त्वा वध्यं मोचयति। कदापि राज्ञः पुत्रो भवति तेन वृद्धिमहोत्सवेन सर्ववध्यानां मोक्षो भवति। कदापि हस्ती बन्धं खण्डयति तेन संभ्रमेण वध्यो मुक्तो भवति। कदापि राजपरिवर्तो भवति तेन सर्ववध्यानां मोक्षो भवति। (p. 314).

81. cf. IX. 10–13 and 15.

82. cf. p. 241.

83. cf. किं न्विदं स्फुरति दक्षिणं लोचनम्। अथवा चारुदत्तस्यैव दर्शनमनिमित्तं प्रमार्जयिष्यति ।p. 182

84. cf. VI. 9–10.

INDEX